

# THE Catholic Mind

## ARTICLES AND ADDRESSES

|   |                          |     |
|---|--------------------------|-----|
| The American Laity                              | Most Rev. R. J. Dwyer    | 129 |
| Catholics and U.S. Labor                        | <i>Jubilee</i>           | 137 |
| K. of C. Advertising<br>Program                 | Luke E. Hart             | 150 |
| Is Peaceful Co-existence<br>Possible?           | Msgr. J. Kozi Horvath    | 156 |
| Your Holy Family                                | <i>Voice of St. Jude</i> | 164 |
| The Catholic's Role in<br>Scientific Psychology | Rev. C. A. Curran        | 169 |

## DOCUMENTATION

|                         |          |     |
|-------------------------|----------|-----|
| Christmas Eve Address   | Pius XII | 178 |
| On Tailors and Fashions | Pius XII | 190 |

53rd YEAR  
OF PUBLICATION

*An America Press Publication*

Twenty-five cents

MARCH, 1955

VOL. LIII, NO. 1107

# BEAUTIFUL BOOKS

## *Spiritually Inspiring for Lenten Reading*

### **That We May Have Hope**

*by William A. Donaghy, S.J.*

Reflections on the Epistles of the Sundays and some of the feasts—to give us an awareness of God's love for us—to cause us to wonder anew “not that we love Him, but that He first loved us.”

\$3.50

### **God In Our House** *by Joseph A. Breig*

Here are delightful conversations between a father and mother and their five children on the Sunday gospels. Easy, everyday language unfolds the wonderful truths that often lie hidden in our faith. “Out of the mouths of children . . .

\$2.50

### **Mary and Modern Man**

*edited by Thomas J. M. Burke, S.J.*

Ten authors, priests and laymen, show that Mary has a place in our life just as she had in the life of Christ and His apostles. This is a practical and convincing presentation of Mary as a cultural ideal for modern man.

\$3.50

### **Shining In Darkness** *by Francis X. Talbot, S.J.*

Thirteen plays retell the gospel narrative of the childhood and risen life of Christ. The first group reconstructs various scenes from Nazareth to Bethlehem to Egypt. The second group deals with events of Easter day, and their aftermath, the following Sunday. Here the sun rises on Golgotha to reveal a Risen Christ and open unbelieving minds and hearts to the reality and meaning of His resurrection.

\$2.00

*(continued on inside back cover)*



# THE Catholic Mind

---

VOL. LIII

MARCH, 1955

NO. 1107

---

## The American Laity

MOST REV. ROBERT J. DWYER  
*Bishop of Reno*

*This adaptation of Bishop Dwyer's address to the Serra International Convention at Grand Rapids, Mich., last summer is reprinted from the COMMONWEAL.\**

ONE hundred and sixty-five years ago, on November 6, 1789, the Holy See proclaimed the establishment of the Diocese of Baltimore and named the Very Reverend John Carroll as its first Bishop. So it was that the same year which saw the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of these United States witnessed also the birth of the American Church as an integrated unit of the Mystical Body of Christ.

In Bishop Carroll's diocese, stretching from New England to Georgia and from the Atlantic coast to the Mississippi, he counted

something like 40,000 of the laity in a population of nearly 4 million, and his priests mustered a bare thirty, several of them already beyond the years of service.

By 1808 the advancement of the Church had gone forward with such strides that it was found necessary to create Baltimore a metropolitan see, with New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Bardstown as suffragans. By then the American Church had its first seminary, and colleges and schools were struggling to the fore. When death came for Carroll in 1815, the Church had gained sufficient strength to enable it to

breast and survive the period of testing which then awaited it.

Wherein lay the secret of Archbishop Carroll's architectural genius in building the Church? The immediate answer, obviously, acknowledges the grace of God and the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit. But there is a second answer, which contains the germ of this discussion. Carroll grasped, with a clarity of vision and purpose unique in his time, the necessity of cordial cooperation between hierarchy and laity in performing the work of the Church. The phrase is borrowed from the definition of Catholic Action given us by the late Pope Pius XI. Archbishop Carroll, a century and a half earlier, and without troubling himself over phrases or definitions, had made this cooperation a part of American Catholic life.

#### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIERARCHY AND LAITY

It is difficult for us to realize, at this remove, the well-nigh revolutionary nature of Archbishop Carroll's approach to the problem of the relationship between hierarchy and laity. He was a man of the eighteenth century, a period of Church history marked preeminently by what might almost be called a line of demarcation between the bishops of the Church—with the higher clergy in close

alliance—and the lower clergy and the inarticulate laity on the other hand.

In France, still the Eldest Daughter of the Church, there was the clerical estate, separate from nobility and commons. If in villages and country places there survived a spirit of understanding and union between priest and people, there was appallingly little of it left in the cities and almost none in those exalted realms where the lords spiritual occupied themselves with matters only vaguely pertaining to the welfare of the Church. It was all to come crashing down in the enormous catastrophe of the Revolution, and the tragedy of it is that so drastic a house-cleaning was inevitable, sweeping away, as it did, so much that was venerable along with so much that was decayed. But the fact is that for Christendom pre-Revolutionary France was widely regarded as the ideal.

The characteristics of the French Church were accepted as norms almost everywhere in Europe and in Latin America. It was taken for granted that a bishop should live in practical isolation from his flock, and it was hardly thought of that there should be actual cooperation between hierarchy and laity in carrying out the work of the Church. This, of course, is sketching in broadest outline; that there were notable and glorious exceptions to



these generalities goes without saying; but the exceptions do not lighten the total picture, nor did they actually prevent the Church from suffering enormous harm when the Revolution struck.

To the extent that Archbishop Carroll was influenced by his acquaintance with the Catholic Church in England, where he had many personal contacts, he undoubtedly saw the advantages of a different spirit. The English Church was then living practically in the catacombs, still laboring under the remembered weight of the penal system. The Vicars Apostolic led hidden lives, seeking out opportunities of gathering their priests and people together in alleys and ale-houses, under conditions not unlike the Early Church of the martyrs. But whatever the hardships, one golden result was forthcoming, a feeling of intimate unity between the bishops and their people. Their cause was one, as their sufferings were born in common. Nor was Carroll unaware of the even more intimate relations of the Irish bishops and priests with their laity. In the long record of bitter persecution endured by prelate and layman alike in Ireland, he read the emphatic lesson that the strength of the

Church lies always in their union of heart and mind.

Added to these influences, he was an American. Attached as he was to the principle of authority as a Catholic and as a priest—indeed, as a member of the Society of Jesus before its suppression—he nevertheless was in cordial agreement with the demand for independence for the American colonies. When our Revolution broke out, he was ready to give his services, along with Benjamin Franklin, as an envoy to the French of British Canada in an effort, which proved fruitless, to persuade them to join the American cause. With most of his priests and practically all of his people, he was a patriot without reserve. He hailed the new democracy as the world's best hope, and he never regretted or retracted his decision. More than that, he recognized in American democracy a fresh leaven in which the Church could grow and flourish.

So it was throughout his ministry in the land of his birth, as priest, as Prefect-Apostolic and as Bishop, Carroll strove to reconcile the familiar customs of the Church with the conditions of this New World. While asserting without fear or favor the rights of ecclesiastical

authority, he would associate himself as closely as possible with his people. He was their shepherd not only by way of a scriptural figure of speech, but as one moving among them, living their lives, entering into their joys and sorrows. He was no alienated man, cherishing some fond illusion that the Church in America could be built on a pre-Revolutionary French model, with the bishop occupying an estate all by himself. This, incidentally, was probably not easy for John Carroll, for he was not what one would describe as a man of naturally warm sympathies, but rather remote and reserved. He broke through the barrier, nevertheless, with the result that during his years as head of the American Church he created an authentic atmosphere of trust and cooperation between himself, his priests and his people.

### TRUSTEEISM

It was well that Archbishop Carroll had built so firmly this spirit of understanding between the laity and the hierarchy in America. Even before his death and disturbing his last years the rumblings of troubles ahead were audible. The inner history of the Catholic Church in America from Carroll's death in 1815 until the eve of the Civil War is largely concerned with the controversy called Trusteeism. This was one of the major factors in the

shaping of the Church as it is to-day—for better and for worse. Without understanding it we cannot fully grasp why the Church still entertains certain stubborn fears and disquietudes in the matter of full cooperation between hierarchy and laity. Perhaps, with a heightened understanding, we may be better able to lay some of the ghosts which still lurk in our closets.

Trusteeism, briefly, was an effort on the part of a small minority of American lay Catholics, aided and abetted (when not actually led) by a few discontented priests, to overthrow the authority of the bishops. It was strongly tinged by Protestantism, strongly influenced by ideas borrowed from Rousseau and the *Philosophes*, strongly infested by the leveling tendencies in our own American Revolution against which Washington himself was so vigorously opposed. It sought, first of all, to deny to the American bishops the actual ownership of Church properties, which the malcontents asserted should be vested in bodies called trustees, and in which the bishops should have only their individual voice. It went on to claim that the appointments or dismissals of parish priests should rest with the trustees, not with the bishops, and so with the foundation of parishes and the establishment and conduct of diocesan schools and charitable insti-



tutions. In a word, Trusteeism was an attempt to make the American Church a lay church. It would have substituted for cooperation between hierarchy and laity the complete subservience of hierarchy to laity, on the plan so commonly followed by the American Protestants in their various frames of church government.

### VERGING ON CHAOS

Be it confessed, not all of Archbishop Carroll's contemporaries and successors in the American hierarchy were men of his judgment and prudence; not all shared his convictions concerning the congeniality of our democratic institutions for the growth and prosperity of the Church. The West had its great apostle in Flagnet, the South soon would have its stalwart England of Charleston, Boston its gentle Cheverus, but Baltimore, Philadelphia and New York, key cities and sees, were assigned to men who had neither the vision nor the ability to cope with the situation, aggravated as it was by Trusteeism. The result was a period verging on chaos for the American Church. For a time, in the '20s, '30s, and on into the '40s of the last century, it seemed as though large segments of the Church might drift into actual schism and ultimate heresy.

The factors which prevented

such a disaster were many, among which may be noted the beginning of the great Irish and German Catholic immigrations to these shores, bringing vast populations who were not interested in this particular quarrel; the outbreak of the Know-Nothing movement, violently anti-Catholic, which caused in reaction a closing of our own ranks in defense; and the success, after long struggles, of the majority of the bishops in disciplining the refractory priests and in asserting their authority over both the spiritualities and the temporalities of the Church. And added to these perhaps the most important factor of all, the foundation spirit of mutual understanding between hierarchy and laity which was Archbishop Carroll's enduring legacy.

Trusteeism had to be crushed, no doubt about that, for had it not been rooted out, it would have warped and sprung the Catholic Church in this country. But as is the case with almost every draconian measure, the rooting out of Trusteeism meant also the damaging of the original American Catholic spirit which has been identified here with Archbishop John Carroll. Essential as was the victory for the divinely established authority of the bishops to rule their dioceses as successors of the Apostles, and not as chairmen of governing boards, it nevertheless

resulted in a situation where the part of the laity in this cooperative effort which is the work of the Church was reduced almost to a minimum. There was nothing obnoxious in the original concept of laymen acting as trustees of the churches and institutions, so long as this meant cordial and sincere cooperation with bishops and pastors, with prompt and respectful acknowledgment of the voice of authority when it spoke out in final decision. There is much, theoretically, in favor of an ideal arrangement in which the temporalities of the Church should be confided in large measure at least to the care of the laity, leaving the clergy untrammelled for the cure of souls. But as a matter of historical record, the reaction against Trusteeism, in the form of lay interference and arrogation of authority, took the form of the practical exclusion of the laity from any discretion in the temporalities of the Church.

Another factor which gave impetus to the development of the American Church along lines of exclusive clerical control was the enormous influx of immigrants. The average Catholic newcomer, hampered by educational, linguistic and social handicaps, had few ambitions for leadership in Church affairs. He was willing enough to leave the running of the church to his pastor, a wiser man than he,

and to the bishop, of whom he stood in wordless awe. It was the business of the clergy alone, as he saw it, to manage the Church according to their greater enlightenment; it was his business to get ahead and to save his soul. Cooperation as a principle in the life of the Church never entered his head, nor was it suggested from the pulpit, save as a matter of the collection. Other than that, it might as well have been a temptation of the devil.

#### NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE AMERICAN LAITY

But times change, and, saving that which is changeless in the deposit of faith and in the constitution of God's Church, we change with them. Never, even in the darkest hours of the reaction against the virus of Trusteeism was lay-cooperation in the work of the hierarchy wholly forgotten or ignored. Most American bishops and priests, however jealous of their rights and privileges, were not insensible of the vast reservoir of power in the laity. Indeed, the whole point and purpose of the mighty effort of building the Catholic school system was not merely the negative hope of preserving the Faith, but the positive determination to create an educated and responsible laity. The Councils of Baltimore, in 1852, 1866 and 1884, stressed and reiterated this objective. At the end of



the century there was held in the primate city, at the invitation of Cardinal Gibbons, a national congress of the American laity, and in the vastly interesting records of this meeting there is written large the almost pathetic eagerness of its leaders, men like the late William J. Onahan of Chicago, to do more for the Church than merely occupy the pews, receive the Sacraments and contribute toward its support. The congress, however, was perhaps a trifle premature. The more conservative members of the hierarchy bethought themselves again of Trusteeism, not yet a dead issue in some areas, and the storms raised at the time over the issues of so-called "Americanism" and the much more real threat of Modernism made it impractical to call the congress into further sessions.

### NCWC

There was no gainsaying the fact, however, that the new century was insisting upon a larger spirit. At the end of the first world war the bishops of America, gathered together in Washington to launch the National Catholic Welfare Conference on a permanent basis, issued in 1919 their famous statement on the reconstruction of the social order, John A. Ryan's masterpiece. It made clear their mind concerning the active participation of the laity in the whole pro-

gram of giving Catholic life in this country a fresh impetus. And as the work of the Conference developed, through the '20s and the '30s, lay activity in cooperation with the hierarchy became a cardinal objective, with the establishment of the departments devoted specifically to men, women and youth. Finally, as a kind of seal of approval on this entire movement, there came from Rome, during the pontificate of Pope Pius XI, the clarion call for Catholic Action, with its specific definition of the program as the vital participation of the laity in the work of the hierarchy.

During the past three decades, certainly, rapid progress has been made in the development of a spirit of genuine union of purpose and effort. Much has been done to overcome the old hesitations, both on the part of the clergy and the laity. Yet it is almost superfluous to remark that we have only begun to utilize this tremendous potential of cooperative zeal. We are still feeling our way along. No one in his right mind—his Catholic mind—wants anything like a return to the flagrant evils of Trusteeism. We are agreed that the center and source of inspiration and direction must remain where it was placed by nothing less than the Divine Will which established the Church, in the episcopate. Any diminution of this authority or any tampering

with it can only bring disaster upon us. But at the same time we are still searching for new methods, new channels, for significant lay activity. Some we have explored already and found useful and profitable in varying degrees, but it would be stupid to suppose that we have done much more than scratch the surface.

### OUR GREATEST WEAKNESS

And it is precisely in this matter of the cooperation of the hierarchy and the laity that there is found the greatest weakness in the Church in America. How quick our opponents are to grasp the significance of this weakness is demonstrated by their constant efforts to create an atmosphere of distrust in this very area. Men like Paul Blanshard are anything but fools. Their persistence in trying to persuade America and American Catholics in particular that the hierarchy is a purely self-seeking body of men, who work day and night to keep the laity in abject subjection and blind ignorance, intimates the wisdom of the serpent. For they realize very clearly that up to the present moment we have not perfected the means of putting our potential of cooperation to work. They know that a distinguishing characteristic of the vast bulk of American Catholics is an enormous absence of personal responsibility for the

work of the Church, and they are keenly aware that not too much is being done to remedy the situation. They have found the vacuum.

That vacuum is primarily our concern, as it is our reproach. It is our task to fill it with the Actual Grace of God's saving activity, moving men to perform their appropriate personal share in this divine work.

Our history, which leaves us, perhaps, with the vague sense that just about now we are catching up with where we were when we started, has at least an instructive value. We have gained a considerable experience in our fairly brief span, without, fortunately, too great an expenditure of tears. If we can honestly say now that we know where we are going and what goals it is necessary for us to achieve, that in itself is no small advantage. The Catholic Church in America tomorrow will be the same as she was yesterday and is today, but that is not to say that it will not be stronger and even more intensely Catholic by reason of the closer, more intimate, more fruitful spirit of cooperation of bishops, priests and laity working together. It may even, please God, remind another generation of that primitive Church of the Apostles when "the multitude of believers had but one heart and one mind."



# Catholics and U.S. Labor

RITA JOSEPH AND ROBERT L. REYNOLDS

*Reprinted from JUBILEE\**

ON September 6, 1954, the 17 million men and women of organized labor, and with them the whole nation, celebrated America's 61st Labor Day. Though the origins of the U.S. Labor movement go back much further than 1894, when Congress first decreed that "one day in the year be designated as Labor Day and be established as a general holiday for the laboring class," it is the past sixty-one years which have witnessed labor's growth from an often violent adolescence to a responsible maturity. In 1894 George M. Pullman of the Pullman Company could tell an employe grievance-committee, "We have nothing to arbitrate." Later that same year, when Pullman workers struck, President Grover Cleveland, over the objections of the mayor of Chicago and the governor of Illinois, could—and did—order a regiment of regular army troops to Chicago to enforce a Federal court injunction against the strikers, saying: "If it takes the entire army and navy of the United States to deliver a postal card in Chicago, that card will be delivered."

By this time in Europe it was already true, as Pius XI was to lament forty years later, that the masses of the working people had been lost to the Church. That the same tragedy did not take place in the United States was due to the efforts of courageous American bishops like James Cardinal Gibbons, a handful of pioneering "labor priests," and Catholic labor leaders like Terence Powderly of the Knights of Labor, Peter McGuire of the Carpenters and John Mitchell of the Mine Workers. It was because of these men that the average Catholic worker was not put in the position of feeling that he had to choose between loyalty to his Church and loyalty to his union. Consequently, he has been free to enter and to rise in union ranks, to organize his fellow workers and to participate at all levels of union activities without any opposition from Church authorities and with a great deal of encouragement. If it is a measure of the growing power and maturity of organized labor that Pullman's sneer and Cleveland's high-handedness would be ridiculous in

\* 377 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y., September, 1954

1954, it is a measure of public respect for the Church's official attitude toward labor that cartoons like the one *Puck* printed in 1887 castigating Cardinal Gibbons for championing labor's rights would be equally unthinkable.

The labor movement in the United States was born within—and fathered by—an industrial system whose size and strength burgeoned rapidly while it took a terrible toll in the lives and health of its employes. Even before the Civil War, though his protest was only too rare, Father Augustus J. Thebaud, S.J., who was pastor of a Troy, N. Y., parish from 1852 to 1860, characterized the attitude of the industrialists to his workers as “strictly a matter of business, of wages and work.”

In the late 1840's young girls employed in New England textile mills worked a 75-hour week for a total wage of less than \$1.50. An open letter to employers in the *Voice of Industry* complained that sleeping accommodations maintained for their workers by the mill owners allowed “but one room for six persons and generally crowd twelve and sometimes sixteen females into the same hot, ill-ventilated attic . . . You shut up the operatives two or three hours longer a day in your factory prisons than is done in Europe . . . You allow them but half an hour to eat their meals . . . You compel them to stand so long at the machinery . . . that

varicose veins, dropsical swelling of the feet and limbs, and prolapsus uteri, diseases that end only with life, are not rare but common occurrences.” Sixty years later, in 1901, anthracite coal miners in Pennsylvania were making only \$300 a year, though a living wage was estimated at \$585. One employer in Holyoke, Mass., found his workers were sleepy because they had eaten breakfast before coming to work. He ordered them to report in the future *before* breakfast. A factory agent whose attitude was typical said: “I regard my work-people just as I regard my machinery. So long as they can do my work for what I choose to pay them, I keep them, getting out of them all I can.”

### ECONOMIC LIBERALISM

Conditions like these were made possible by the prevailing atmosphere of Economic Liberalism, a free-wheeling social theory rooted in the philosophies of Hobbes, Locke and Hume, which sanctioned rugged individualism, no-holds-barred competition and free trade.

Economic Liberalism—which affected a large number of Catholics—gained a certain religious sanction from the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, according to which a man's material riches and business success indicated that he was leading a good Christian life and was destined for eternal salvation. Em-



ployers thus came to regard themselves as custodians of their workers' morals. In 1830, arguing against a movement to shorten working hours, one employer claimed that "The morals of the operatives will necessarily suffer, if longer absent from the wholesome discipline of factory life, and leaving them thus to their will and liberty, without warrant that this time will be well employed."

Though at the time of labor's early organizing efforts a majority of Catholics were workingmen, a number of factors combined to delay any official Catholic pronouncement on labor's rights and thus to cause many to doubt just where the Church stood. To begin with, Catholic attention was centered elsewhere. Shortly before the Civil War, anti-Catholic feeling had been given political organization in the Know-Nothing or American Party. Similar sentiments flared up again, though less seriously, in the 1880's. The birth and growth of anti-Catholic prejudices coincided with the arrival of two great waves of immigrants, many of whom were Catholic. The sheer weight of the immigrants' numbers terrorized the "nativists," who feared that the newcomers would depress the general wage level.

The secrecy of labor organization also helped retard full approval by Catholic bishops of Catholic participation in the labor movement. Because

in the early days the new unions faced not only the opposition of employers but the distrust of the press and the public as well, a certain amount of secrecy had to be adopted if organization was to get beyond the preliminary stages. When the Knights of Labor, perhaps the first labor organization to attain mass status, was founded in 1869, it was so secretive that in the beginning not even its name was made public. The ritual and by-laws were passed on from member to member by word of mouth. Many priests and bishops became suspicious of these secret organizations and were sincerely concerned about their effect on the faith of Catholic workingmen. Even Archbishop James Gibbons, whose approval of the Knights was later to mean so much, distrusted some of the secret aspects of the organization in these early days. Moreover, there was a strong Socialist participation in a number of unions to which Catholics belonged.

#### NEGLECT OF SOCIAL STUDIES

Added to the clergy's distrust of secret organizations and its fear of Socialism was its lack of social education. In later years Monsignor John A. Ryan, one of the early 20th century's most articulate and socially-conscious priests, could say that he had not read his first textbook on economics until he left the seminary in 1894. Social studies were neg-

lected in American seminaries, whose curricula were still primarily European in outlook, even though seminarians were being prepared for an apostolate that would have to be carried out in predominantly Protestant America, with all of its quickly shifting complexities and its fast-growing social problems.

The turning point came in the late 1880's after Jay Gould and a group of powerful railroad directors met with members of the executive board of the Knights of Labor in New York in the summer of 1885 to settle a strike which threatened to tie up a major section of the nation's transportation system. It was the first time in America's history that the power of organized labor had received such recognition. Between July 1, 1885, when its strike ended in victory, and the following June, the Knights' membership shot up from 100,000 to 700,000. Conservative opinion was alarmed. "Five men in this country," said the *New York Sun*, referring to the Knights' officers, "control the chief interests of five hundred thousand workingmen, and can at any moment take the means of livelihood from two and a half million souls."

#### CARDINAL GIBBONS AND THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR

The Grand Master Workman of the Knights was 36-year-old Terence V. Powderly, a Catholic. Powderly, who later left the Church and died

a Mason, was a reserved, mild-mannered teetotaler. ("At a picnic where . . . the girls as well as the boys swill beer I cannot talk at all," he once said.) He stood on his dignity, dressed quietly and never seemed quite at home in labor gatherings. Nevertheless, in 1886 he was perhaps the most powerful labor leader the country had seen up to that time. Because of scattered acts of violence and the secret aspects of the organization, the Knights of Labor had been condemned in Canada by Quebec's Cardinal Taschereau. His action was upheld by the Holy Office. Fearing that a similar condemnation might occur in the United States, Powderly went to Archbishop James Gibbons of Baltimore, the most influential man in the American hierarchy, to explain the real nature and purpose of his union. He managed to win a resourceful, determined and farsighted advocate in Gibbons, who invited Powderly to address a meeting of the twelve Archbishops. All but two were satisfied after hearing Powderly, strongly backed up by Gibbons himself, argue that the dangers to Catholics who joined the Knights were largely imaginary. In the Spring of 1887, when Gibbons went to Rome to receive the red hat of a cardinal, he pleaded the cause of the Knights of Labor at the Vatican. With the support of England's Cardinal Manning, he won his case. Instead of condemning the organization, as the



Holy Office had done in the case of Canada, Pope Leo XIII found no objection to the U. S. Knights of Labor.

The importance of Gibbons' action, as far as Catholic participation in the labor movement is concerned, is difficult to over-emphasize. Had his decision and that of the Vatican been different, generations of Catholic workers might have been cut off from the Church. As brutally oppressed and as eager to secure justice for themselves as were their non-Catholic fellows, they would have faced a decision more difficult than any individual should be asked to make. As Gibbons himself later said:

While many bishops were alarmed at what they considered the revolutionary tendencies [of certain recently formed workingmen's associations], many other bishops, including Cardinal Manning and myself, were equally alarmed at the prospect of the Church being presented before our age as the friend of the powerful rich and the enemy of the helpless poor; for not only would such an alliance, or even apparent alliance, have done the Church untold harm, but it would have been the *bouleversement* of our whole history. Moreover, to us it seemed that such a thing could never take place. The one body in the world which had been the protector of the poor and the weak for nearly 1,800 years, could not possibly desert these same classes in their hour of need.

When the Knights were at the crest of their power after the victory over Gould, Powderly was falsely pictured

as an all-powerful labor dictator. A humanitarian at heart, a man with a long-range approach at a time when short-run gains were the aim of most labor leaders, he frequently tried to stave off the more hot-headed among his subordinates. But he was not a strong leader, and could not cope with the sudden upward rise in the membership of his sprawling organization. "The position I hold," he confessed, "is too big for any ten men. It is certainly too big for me." Badly organized and undisciplined, the Knights lost several key strikes in the next few years. Despite Powderly's attempt to dissuade them, thousands of Knights took part in Chicago's general strike of 1886, which, starting as a peaceable demonstration in behalf of the eight-hour day, exploded into violence and death in Haymarket Square on the night of May 4. Staggered by successive defeats and by the loss of whatever public sympathy it had enjoyed, the strength of the Knights of Labor began to ebb and finally to peter out in petty bickerings. By 1893, when Powderly was ousted, the membership had shrunk to a mere 75,000. The Knights of Labor was all but dead.

Fortunately for the cause of organized labor, there was in existence a sound labor federation ready to pick up the pieces when the Knights' castle came tumbling down. Overshadowed during the 1880's by Powderly's group, the American Federation of

Labor had grown strong under the dedicated, competent and solid leadership of Samuel Gompers, aided by men like Adolph Strasser and Peter J. McGuire of the Carpenters and Joiners. "The Gompers are built of oak," Gompers said, and the labor federation which he shaped and headed until his death in 1924 has proved just as enduring.

### THE 1902 COAL STRIKE

In May of 1902, 140,000 Eastern Pennsylvania anthracite miners under the leadership of John Mitchell, ■ convert to Catholicism and the president of the United Mine Workers, struck for an increase in their annual wage, which averaged \$300. As the strike dragged on and the misery of the miners and their families increased, George F. Baer, spokesman for the mine operators, answered an appeal to settle the strike with ■ letter which has become a classic: "I beg of you not to be discouraged," he said. "The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for—not by the labor agitators, but by the Christian men of property to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given control of the property interests of this country . . ."

When Father John J. Curran, ■ pastor in Wilkes-Barre, who had at first been against the strike, saw Baer's letter he termed it "sweeping and astounding" and used his influence to get it published. Public opin-

ion was immediately won to the side of the miners. With the support of Bishop Hoban of Scranton, Father Curran worked steadily for a settlement. Finally, President Theodore Roosevelt called Mitchell and Baer to the White House. Mitchell immediately offered to arbitrate, but Baer, rebuking the President for "negotiating with the fomenters of anarchy," would not submit to arbitration until Roosevelt had threatened Baer's banker, J. P. Morgan, with army seizure of the mines. Though the miners were awarded a 10 per cent wage increase, the owners refused to recognize the union. But what made the strike important from labor's point of view was that for the first time ■ President of the United States had intervened in a strike, not to break it, but to help settle it.

When John Mitchell and the United Mine Workers struck against the mine operators in 1902, a young priest named John A. Ryan was teaching in the seminary at St. Paul, Minnesota. Ordained only eight years before, he was just starting his campaign for social justice. As a professor of moral theology and industrial ethics in the Catholic University, and as first director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Ryan was to lead U. S. Catholic social thinking almost until his death in 1945. A prolific writer and a forceful teacher, he influenced ■ large number of priests



and laymen who are still carrying on his work.

The early years of Ryan's priesthood—the period between the turn of the century and America's entry into World War I—were years of growth for the American Federation of Labor. But though Catholics formed a majority of its members, most U.S. bishops were pre-occupied with the rising influence of Socialism, and, nationally at least, the principles of *Rerum Novarum* were not strongly implemented.

In 1910 Msgr. William J. White of Brooklyn told the first convention of the National Conference of Catholic Charities: "It is time for us to awake to the fact that if we wish to keep our workingmen practical Catholics, we must give them some tangible proof that the Church is alive to the struggle they are making to better their material conditions."

### BISHOPS' PROGRAM

The "tangible proof" came in 1919, when the American hierarchy issued its now-famous Bishops' Program advocating sweeping reforms: a minimum wage, unemployment insurance, a minimum age limit of 16 for children in industry, recognition of labor's right to organize, public housing for workers, the regulation of excessive profits and incomes, the control of monopolies and a wider participation by labor in ownership through cooperatives and through

workers' purchasing of corporation stock. With a few additions, the Bishops' Program was based on a speech which Father Ryan had prepared for a Knights of Columbus gathering.

Though much hope and a great deal of discussion followed upon the issuance of the Bishop's Program of 1919, practical response to it and to the other social programs proposed at the same time was almost nil. When the war ended, labor was aggressively determined to consolidate its wartime gains; management was equally determined to withdraw its wartime concessions. Moreover, the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917 gave rise to a "red scare" in the United States, and in the wave of strikes between 1919 and 1921 employers tried—and in many cases succeeded—in identifying labor organizers as "red agitators."

The 1920's, years of feast for industry, were years of famine for organized labor. "For more than a decade," Monsignor Ryan later wrote, "social thinking and social action were chilled and stifled in an atmosphere of pseudo-prosperity and thinly disguised materialism." The American Federation of Labor was hampered by "yellow dog" contracts and the widespread encouragement, by employers, of company unions. It was an era of company paternalism, in which employes got so many benefits that not a few were convinced

unions were unnecessary. Union enrollment dropped sharply—between 1920 and 1933 unions lost 1.5 million of their 5 million members—but in the rosy glow of prosperity the individual worker didn't seem to care. Not until four years after the country had seen the boom bust in 1929 was it ready, in the Wagner Act and in other legislation, to enact some of the measures proposed by the Bishops' Program of 1919.

If the 1930's seemed ripe for Communism, they were equally ripe for Catholic social reform. Pope Pius XI's encyclical of 1931, *Quadragesimo Anno*, could hardly have come at a better time. For Catholics, who, like everyone else, were confused and disillusioned by the sudden collapse of an economic dream which had seemed destined to last forever, the Holy Father provided a clear analysis of what had gone wrong and the basis for a positive program which would lift men out of the economic slump. Father Charles Owen Rice remarks of Catholic social action in the early '30's: "You might say, as they said of the Renaissance, that in those days it was good to be alive and to be young was very heaven. The world was simple and justice seemed very easy to find." With the encyclical of Pius XI as their charter and with a passion for justice for the "little guy" as their motivation, more and more Catholics joined the fight for social reform.

With the founding of the C. I. O. in 1936 Philip Murray, a firm believer in the Social Encyclicals, came to the fore as a spokesman for the Christian view in labor. A long-time lieutenant of John L. Lewis, the first president of the C. I. O., Murray was named head of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee. Though retiring in manner, he directed a vigorous campaign which led thousands into the ranks of the C. I. O., and in 1940 he became its president. Murray was one American labor leader who consciously applied the Church's social doctrines to his work; he not only saw labor's viewpoint, he tried to understand management's as well—the steel settlement he helped negotiate shortly before his death in 1952, for example, was a plan not only for labor but for the entire industry.

### ACTU

Catholic labor schools, founded to combat the trend to collectivism on one extreme and individualism on the other, spread to many cities. The members of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists (ACTU) and many of those associated with the labor schools did more than sponsor courses. They established an annual Labor Day Mass in several places, walked picket lines with striking workers, helped in union organizing campaigns, participated in union rallies and published their own labor papers.



The Catholics who were active in these various movements did not by any means constitute a majority of the Catholic body; they still were looked upon as radicals by most in the Church. But their strength was considerable, their sense of comradeship was very real and they saw to it that the Church was not cut off from the workers' struggle for recognition and economic justice. When, during the 1937 strike against "Little Steel" by the newly formed C. I. O., George Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago bluntly said, "Our place is at the side of the poor," he shocked many conservative Catholics. But to those small groups of Catholics all over the country who had already taken their place there, his words were sweet justification.

#### EFFORTS OF BISHOPS AND PRIESTS

Many bishops have become nationally known for their efforts on behalf of labor. As a group, the bishops set up in 1920 what is now known as the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Its Social Action Department is a valuable clearinghouse of news and information on social action. The Department's diocesan Conferences on Industrial Problems, organized for years by Linna Bresette and now by Miss Katherine B. Kelly, bring together labor and management to discuss their respective rights and responsibilities.

In almost every large industrial

area of the United States "labor priests" are active. In New York Father Philip Carey, S. J., and his assistant, Father John M. Corridan, S. J., run the Xavier Labor School. Father William Smith, S. J., operates the St. Peter's College Institute of Industrial Relations in Jersey City. Monsignor Reynold Hillenbrand, the national chaplain of the Young Christian Workers, has inspired a whole generation of socially-conscious priests and laymen in Chicago. One of them is Father Daniel M. Cantwell, the chaplain of Chicago's Catholic Labor Alliance, which runs neighborhood labor courses. Monsignor John T. Boland of Buffalo, N. Y., has been well known for a number of years in statewide mediation work. The director of the Hartford, Connecticut, Diocesan Labor Institute (which has branches in 11 cities) is Monsignor Joseph F. Donnelly, also the Chairman of the State Board of Mediation and Arbitration. Other "labor priests"—to name only a few of dozens—include: Monsignor Thomas J. Tobin of Portland, Oregon, Fathers Ronald L. Heidelberger and Clement Kern of Detroit, Father John Hayes of Chicago, Fathers George E. Lucy, S. J., and Matthew Connolly of San Francisco, Father Jerome A. Drolet of Louisiana, Father Francis J. McDonnell of Boston and Father Jerome L. Toner, O. S. B., of Lacey, Washington.

Among many active laymen are

John C. Cort of the Catholic Labor Guild of Boston, a well-known labor writer, and Martin Wersing, a member of the New York State Mediation Board. Cort and Wersing were among the founders of ACTU. Current ACTU leaders Robert Mozer and Robert O'Neill have recently started labor schools for Puerto Rican workers in New York. Martin Rush and Daniel O'Connor of ACTU's Labor Defense League give free legal aid to workers. ACTU's President, Edward Curley, is also active in organized labor, and another ACTU man, James Conroy, was a key figure in ACTU's campaign to rid the United Electrical Workers of Communists. In Chicago William Lennon, Catholic Labor Alliance, is organizing for an AFL union, and Tony Zivalich, formerly national president of the YCW, is now organizing stockyards workers.

### UNPARALLELED RECORD

The record which Catholic bishops, priests and laymen have written into the history of social reform in America is virtually without parallel among the major religious bodies in this country. Haltingly at times, but uninterruptedly, Catholics have maintained a tradition of active participation in the labor movement which has made the Catholic Church recognized throughout organized labor as the friend of workingmen.

Those who seek any single source

of this tradition are bound to be disappointed. Catholics have been active in labor for a number of reasons. To begin with, the ancestors of most present-day American Catholics entered this country as immigrants, at the very bottom of the economic scale. Along with many who were not Catholics, they built this country's railroads, riveted together the steel skeletons and laid the bricks of its skyscrapers, built its homes, mined its coal and tended the blast furnaces which lit up the sky over Pittsburgh and Gary. When in the early days they were exploited, they joined unions to protect themselves. When some of their sons and grandsons became priests, they remembered very vividly the harsh working conditions and long hours their fathers had to endure and the low wages with which they kept the family together. The priest-director of an eastern labor school still has in his desk drawer a time-book in which his father, a streetcar conductor, kept track of his working hours so the company would not cheat him of his wages. The entries for one week in 1916 show that he made \$21.43 for 82½ hours of work. Memories like these made many a priest, when he got a parish of his own, side with his workingclass parishioners when they struck for higher wages.

Traditionally, in the early days, the wealth of this country was in the hands of non-Catholics; when man-



agement and labor sat down to arbitrate a wage dispute, Catholics were generally on labor's side of the table. In the years after the turn of the century it was estimated that Catholics made up two-thirds of the membership of the AFL, and that between 1900 and 1918 the presidents of more than 50 AFL international unions were Irish Catholics. It was natural then that the instinctive sympathies of a great number of Catholics should lie with labor.

#### LABOR-MANAGEMENT FIELD

Several other factors should be cited as influencing Catholics to enter the labor-management field. One has already been discussed here: the key decision of Cardinal Gibbons to prevent a Vatican ban on Catholic membership in the Knights of Labor. Leo XIII's encyclical and later the Bishops' Program of 1919 and the 1931 encyclical of Pius XI all gave tremendous encouragement to American Catholics. Taken together, these things strengthened the conviction of "labor priests" and Catholic unionists that their work enjoyed Church sanction.

Another factor, allied to these, is the freedom of action which the vast majority of American bishops, down through the years, have allowed their priests and laymen in regard to organized labor, even though the bishops personally did not always agree with some of the stands which a sym-

pathy for the labor movement led these men to take. During the years when Father (later Monsignor) John A. Ryan was active, his forthright position on a number of issues often met with opposition from many bishops. Yet they did not deny or attempt to curtail his right to speak his mind. As a professor at the Catholic University in 1918, for example, he favored a child labor amendment. One of those who disagreed was Bishop Michael J. Curley of Baltimore, in whose diocese the university was located. Some opponents of the amendment tried to influence the bishop to declare the measure Socialistic, but Bishop Curley would not ally himself with them. "If Doctor Ryan does not agree with me," he said, "he is at perfect liberty to disagree. . . . I am not opposed to the Child Labor Amendment because it is Socialistic. Many who stand for the measure are not Socialists. President Coolidge is certainly not a Socialist; nor is Doctor Ryan. . . ."

Finally, Catholics have been welcomed by American labor unions because they have never tried to organize Catholic unions. Unions organized along religious lines were common in Europe, but there were few American Catholics who did not realize that in the United States such unions would split the unity of the labor movement and precipitate factional strife. Throughout their existence, down to the present day, Cath-

olic labor schools and associations of Catholic workingmen have placed their emphasis on training Catholics to be alert, effective union members and leaders, not in order to make their unions Catholic unions, but better instruments for securing the rights of all their members, Catholic and non-Catholic.

In this connection, some "labor priests," even today, are caught in an uncomfortable cross-fire. From one side come the attacks of those conservative Catholics who believe that a priest has no business taking an active part in the labor field. From the non-Catholic left-wing press such priests are sometimes pictured as attempting to wield a sinister clerical influence over Catholic labor leaders. A few years ago New York's now defunct *Daily Compass* falsely accused several "labor priests" of dictating policy to Catholic labor leaders like Philip Murray of the C. I. O., James Carey of the International Union of Electrical Workers and David McDonald of the Steelworkers. The paper made much of the presence of priests at union conventions, hinted darkly that they were engaged in backstairs politicking, and implied that the Catholic labor leaders could not make a move without first clearing it with a priest.

In 1954 many of labor's biggest battles have been won: the mass industries like steel and auto-making have been organized, and most of

labor's basic rights have been guaranteed by Federal law. Unions have grown enormously; like all human organizations which are big, they have tended to become complex. Though many of them have acquired a sense of responsibility, some have not; though most of them have honest leaders, the officers of some are corrupt; though some labor leaders see beyond the short-range goals of higher wages and shorter hours, many do not. Furthermore, if the general atmosphere of prosperity during World War II and the years since has caused many union members to be apathetic about attending union meetings, the various Catholic labor schools and associations have felt the same slackening of interest, and for the same reason.

#### ADAPTING METHODS TO NEW CONDITIONS

Catholic labor schools and labor associations are beginning to adapt their methods to the changed conditions. The director of one of them said recently: "Workers don't want to be lectured to any more. My real work is accomplished when we talk together informally about specific problems that workers bring in." Though formal training in parliamentary procedure, organizing techniques, labor history and the like must still be stressed, there is a growing realization that a deep spiritual formation is more necessary than ever



if the motivation of Catholics who enter the labor movement is to stand up under disillusionment and the hard, unglamorous grind which responsible union membership requires.

Catholic laymen who have actually gotten into the modern labor movement know that the field is not for the innocent. One of them, a member of a corrupt building trades local, wanted to start a house cleaning. Twenty-five years ago he might have been walking a picket line, and might have been in danger of being clubbed by a company-hired strikebreaker. Instead, one day recently, he found himself attacked by a carful of thugs hired by union officials to discourage his "meddling."

And today this kind of work demands persistence. One young graduate of a Catholic women's college took a job with the C. I. O., trying to oust a Communist-dominated local from a West Coast factory. During the campaign she had to convince her fellow union workers that the literature they were handing out didn't have to be misleading to be effective. When the campaign was won, it was feared that Communists would try to

infiltrate the non-Communist union, and she had to remain to help train sound leaders to take over.

Catholic movements like the ACTU, the Young Christian Workers and the labor schools—there are nearly 100 of them according to a recent count—have begun to "graduate" a growing body of well-trained, spiritually-mature young men and women who are now finding their way into labor unions all over the country, some as national organizers, some as officers of locals, some merely as active members of the rank and file. They and the priests who train them are carrying on a long and honorable tradition. Because a truly just economic order has still to be achieved, and because Christian principles demand continued devotion if they are not to remain catchwords, these men and women have the task of extending that tradition and adapting it to modern conditions. But their aim remains the same aim Catholics in labor have always had: to keep the labor movement true to itself, to those whose welfare it cares for, and to the nation into whose fabric it is woven.

### ***"Root of All Evil"***

Money invariably corrupts a people who make it their idol. Money, more than marijuana, drugs the higher sensibilities. When its accumulation becomes the center of life's striving, dishonesty and a lust for easy profits take the place of wholehearted service in the common good. From this fermentation selfishness and egocentricity are brewed.—*Father Edward DePersio in the FAR EAST, January, 1955.*

# The K. of C. Advertising Program

LUKE E. HART

*Report of the Supreme Knight to the 72nd K. of C. Convention,  
Louisville, Ky., August 17-19, 1954*

AT EACH Convention since 1948, it has been my pleasure, as Chairman of the Catholic Advertising Committee, to report to you concerning the progress of the Supreme Council's Catholic Advertising. These annual reports, without exception, have constituted a continuing record of accomplishment of which every member may be intensely proud.

But it is a particular pleasure to me that in the past year the Catholic Advertising Program set a new record in the matter of inquiries resulting from the advertising, and in enrollments for instruction which result from the inquiries.

During the past year, for the first time since the inauguration of this activity, the inquiries exceeded 300,000—to be exact, 310,619. That, as you will note, is almost 1,000 inquiries per day for every weekday of the year. The enrollments for religious instruction by mail amount to 40,376, this also being a new record.

The total number of inquiries since the beginning of the program, as of August 1, was 1,606,855. The total

enrolled for instruction as of the same date was 157,658.

What is happening, I am sure, is that more and more people are beginning to realize the value and importance of this program, and are assisting it and making use of the facilities it offers for all sorts of fine Catholic Action.

Many Councils are cooperating by publishing the advertisements in their local papers. Councils, various Catholic societies and individuals are utilizing the Supreme Council's splendid pamphlets in their missionary work. The number of priests who are becoming acquainted with the program and are making use of its materials is constantly increasing. All these things are helping to make the program grow, and it is my earnest hope that in the coming year most of the Councils will publish the advertisements and help us to get the fullest possible distribution of pamphlets to those interested in the True Church.

There is also, I am convinced, another factor in this big gain. These



advertisements, from the beginning, have had a tremendous readership among people who like them because they are provocative, and because they touch upon matters concerning which many people have a great curiosity. Some of these people, we know, have finally broken down and requested a free pamphlet after going along for several years contented to read only the advertisements.

We have not put on any special push, or drive, to bring about this big gain in inquiries and enrollments. As a matter of fact, I had been in office only a short time as Supreme Knight when we found it necessary to take our advertising out of one of the largest Sunday newspaper supplements, *This Week Magazine*, which has a circulation of more than ten millions. You may be interested in hearing about this.

#### ADVERTISEMENT REFUSED

The publishers of *This Week* refused to publish our advertisement entitled: "Does The Bible Contradict Itself?" They did not like this advertisement because it contained Bible quotations condemning divorce and remarriage. This, they said, would be offensive to "many good people who have been divorced and married again." The quotations to which the publishers of *This Week* objected were *not* quotations of Catholic doctrine. They were exact quotations

*right out of the Bible*, and these were the quotations which the publishers of *This Week* felt would "be offensive to many good people." I have heard of all sorts of censorships, but this is the first example I have ever seen of a publisher being unwilling to print an exact quotation from the Bible. I wonder how many of his readers would have been offended by this Bible quotation, compared with the number who would have applauded it.

The publisher of *This Week*, Mr. Sterling, and his Advertising Director, Mr. Covington, called on me at New Haven to explain their refusal to publish this particular advertisement. Their explanations, as far as we are concerned, were not explanations but excuses. They apparently do not, moreover, reflect the views of the publishers and owners of certain of the newspapers comprising the *This Week* chain. I quote you now, for example, the comments of some of these publishers:

Luther L. Hill, the Des Moines *Register and Tribune*:

Your advertisement entitled "Does the Bible Contradict Itself" is acceptable to us. We think *This Week* should accept for publication your above named advertisement.

John W. Moffett, Minneapolis *Star and Tribune*:

If you are unable to come to a reasonable agreement with Mr. Sterling, we would be glad to have you send this advertisement to us.

Charles B. Lord, the Indianapolis *Star and News*:

We want you to know that the copy as submitted with your letter is acceptable for publication in the Indianapolis *Star* and we would be pleased to publish it.

Robert Choate, Boston *Traveler and Sunday Herald*:

If this advertisement were offered to us as an individual newspaper, we certainly should be inclined to accept it.

Wm. W. Knight, Portland, Oregon, *Journal*:

The Oregon *Journal* will be pleased to run this copy for you in its Sunday edition any time you desire.

Frank C. Huntress, San Antonio *Express and News*:

If you care to send us this copy direct with an order to run in the Express and/or the News it will be accepted.

John S. Knight, Chicago *Daily News*: "I would have carried the ad."

John C. A. Watkins, Providence *Journal and Bulletin*:

If the advertisement you enclosed had been submitted directly to us, we would have accepted and printed it.

J. A. V. Buren, Cleveland *Plain Dealer*:

The Plain Dealer will be glad to accept your advertising either in our regular black and white section or in our rotogravure section.

Wm. E. Robinson, New York *Herald Tribune*:

I am glad to be able to tell you that we will be willing to run this advertising in the *Herald Tribune*. I have per-

sonally seen your advertising on many occasions and I don't remember any of it to which our Advertising Acceptance Committee on the *Herald Tribune* could object.

All the other magazines on our schedule published this advertisement without question. That includes the *American Weekly*, *Collier's*, *Parade*, *American Magazine*, *Grit*, *Atlantic Monthly* and *Harper's* in the United States, and *Maclean's*, *Weekend*, *New Liberty* and the *Toronto Star Weekly* in Canada. Only Mr. Sterling and Mr. Covington seem afraid that the Holy Scriptures will offend some good people.

#### CENSORSHIP REJECTED

The publisher of *This Week* requested us to furnish a substitute advertisement for the one entitled: "Does The Bible Contradict Itself?" This we refused to do. We do not grant any publication the right to censor our advertisements, and we therefore canceled our contract with this particular one. This may work out to our eventual advantage, as we have since added to our schedule the Metro Group of Sunday magazines, which has a combined circulation of 14 millions. We are also preparing to add another Sunday magazine newspaper chain which is relatively new, but circulates in small towns and reaches an audience in areas where the Church is sparsely represented.

Statistical reports showing the



success of the advertising apostolate are indeed gratifying. But the thing that gives me the biggest thrill is to read some of the letters relating the effects of the program upon the lives of many of those we reach. There is, for example, a letter received recently from Father Harry F. Turnier, Chaplain of the Florida State Penitentiary, which I am sure will be of great interest to you, as it is to me.

Father Turnier has been working with the Supreme Council's Religious Information Bureau in St. Louis, in the instruction of a number of prisoners in this penitentiary. He writes:

I don't want to close this letter without a line of gratitude for your invaluable help in spreading our Holy Faith. These men may well be likened to souls in purgatory. For they certainly can do precious little in their own behalf with the exception of putting in the time required by law. Your course does much to bolster the faltering faith of the careless Catholic, and to aid and reassure the non-Catholic inquirer. Your efforts are an invaluable assist in my work—and it makes me proud of being a Knight to see your work and its results.

And that's not all, just listen to this next paragraph from Father Turnier's letter:

Through your efforts we were able to make a bit of diocesan history here recently. On the 13th of December, His Grace, Archbishop Joseph P. Hurley, D.D., confirmed a large class of convicts. In practically every instance the preparation of these men and women

was largely the work of your Bureau. The occasion marked the first time that a Roman Catholic prelate ever had occasion to enter the prison gates of the Florida State Penitentiary. And the basic reason for His Grace's visit was, of course, the administration of Confirmation. In the name of all our men, the earthly souls in purgatory, I thank God for your work.

Isn't that, Brother Knights, the type of work that Christ expects of us? Doesn't it make you also, as Father Turnier is, proud to be a Knight and to sponsor such things?

### A TRULY WORTHY WORK

Of all the wonderful stories that have come out of our Advertising Program, one will always stand out as a reminder to me that this is a truly worthy work. This particular story is told by Father Joseph J. Durney, Assistant Pastor of St. Alphonsus Church at Millwood, Missouri, and it concerns an episode that occurred during Father Durney's career as an Army Chaplain.

Father Durney was visiting the sick and wounded who had been transferred from Korea to a Government Hospital in San Francisco. As he made his rounds, he observed a boy saying the Rosary and he realized that the lad was very seriously ill. He had been wounded overseas and the chart on his bed showed that his condition was anything but favorable.

Taking for granted that the boy was a Catholic, Father Durney spoke to him as he would to one familiar with the Rosary and the Sacraments. Only then did the boy tell the priest that he was not a Catholic—that all he knew about the Catholic religion he had learned through the Knights of Columbus. He had read an advertisement while on duty in Korea, had sent for a pamphlet, and had taken the Order's course of instruction by mail. "My duffel bag," he said to Father Durney, "is full of their books and pamphlets." But he had not been baptized . . . he was not yet a Catholic.

Talking with the lad convinced Father Durney that he possessed sufficient knowledge of the Faith to be a Catholic. So he asked him if he wanted to be. The result was that this sick and wounded lad was thereupon baptized; at the same time he received the Last Sacraments of the Church. This was quite important, too, for the next morning the boy died.

The body was sent back to the boy's family at Sioux City, Iowa, and Father Durney went along. None of the other members of the family was Catholic. But the boy's funeral was held at the altar in a Catholic church at Sioux City. The first time he had ever entered a Catholic Church was on this day . . . as a corpse.

I am not going to take your time here to relate the many examples of

conversion which are taking place as a result of the advertising. You have been reading about them regularly in *Columbia*. But before I conclude this report, I *must* tell you how much the Advertising Program is beginning to mean not only in the United States and Canada, but in other lands. And this is of the greatest importance because the Catholic Church is fighting against tremendous odds in many of these places, and the very fate of the world may depend upon the outcome.

In England, long lost to the Church, a group of missionary priests has undertaken a program patterned after ours and already reports excellent results. Our own advertisements, reaching England through copies of American and Canadian magazines sent abroad, likewise have had a potent effect.

#### IN THE PHILIPPINES

The Church is having a difficult struggle in the Philippines to combat anti-Catholic propaganda circulated by proselyting clergymen of other sects, and to counteract the aggressive activities of Aglipayan, a Philippine schismatic church. We have Councils in the Philippines, as you know, and they are working with the priests to combat this opposition. In several cases, the entire membership of a Council has enrolled for the Supreme Council's instruction course at the recommendation of their chap-



lain, and they are thus better equipped to aid the Church in its crucial struggle against other sects and the forces of atheistic Communism.

Make no mistake about this: the enemies of America are the enemies of the Catholic Church. They are working hard in such Catholic countries across the seas as Italy and France, but also on our back doorstep in Guatemala, Colombia, Brazil and other traditionally Catholic lands. And whether consciously or not, proselytizing sects which go into these Catholic countries to "Christianize" them, and engage in the distribution of the same kind of vicious anti-Catholic propaganda they circulate here—these people, I say, are aiding and abetting the atheistic forces which

seek to destroy not only the Catholic Church, but democracy as well.

So I say to you, Brother Knights, nothing we can do is more important than getting behind the Advertising Program with all our energies and enthusiasm. The manner in which we are taking part in the teaching ministry of the Church is without precedent. Ours is a tremendously big opportunity to do much more and to make a truly magnificent contribution not merely as an Order, but as Councils and as individuals.

I hope that none of you will leave this convention without going to the Catholic Advertising booth—to ask questions as to what you and your Council can do to help. And you *can* help, mightily, if you only will!

### *Statism*

The past hundred years have seen immense progress towards more truly democratic forms of government. It is a good step to have abandoned the practice of *Laissez-faire*, but it may be only a step from the frying pan to the fire if governments substitute a policy of *Laissez-rien*. The tendency to govern by an interference which distorts the functions of the state itself and steam-rolls rights of individuals and subsidiary organizations has been labelled Statism. Statism is not all of a piece. There are extreme forms such as Communism, Nazism and Fascism. Within parliamentary democracy there has been a marked tendency on the part of governments to invade the domains that were formerly the preserve of private enterprise. One cannot say a priori that all such tendencies constitute Statism. Various Popes have called on governments for a positive contribution to the welfare of citizens. But even within parliamentary democracy and while avoiding extremes it is possible to lead almost imperceptibly to an unhealthy proportion of Statism. — *Patrick Corcoran, C. M. in CHRISTUS REX, October, 1954.*

# Is Peaceful Co-existence Possible?

MSGR. JOSEPH KOZI HORVATH

*Statement of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe presented at the Semaine Sociale, Pau, France, July 20-26, 1953*

**L**ARGE masses of people behind the Iron Curtain, as well as in the free world, are longing for a prolonged period of peace. There is no doubt that Christians living in the temporal order must do their utmost to promote the realization of this longing. Mankind, aspiring toward the improvement of human conditions and the lifting of living standards, can hope for the betterment of material life only if peace is maintained in the world. Peace is an indispensable condition of prosperity and an essential element of the common good. It is "the tranquil security of an order of justice and charity which procures for each state, together with the full enjoyment of its rights, the most efficacious means of fulfilling its social mission and of contributing its share to the common good of international society" (*Code of International Ethics*, p. 106, The Newman Press, Westminster, Md., 1953). In a society of independent states which have not yet succeeded in establishing a supranational authority, it is above all necessary that

the order of right and justice should prevail in order to insure peace.

Whatever peaceful intentions Christians may have, they also have the duty to think in realistic terms, especially regarding problems of peace. A Christian who succumbs to wishful thinking does not serve the cause of true peace. To expect peaceful co-existence, for example, from a member or sector of international society which constantly denies justice and radiates hate instead of charity, which does not disarm and does not renounce its rapacious aims, weakens the will for self-preservation and lulls the sane instinct of self-defense. Not being realistic, such an expectation does not lead to peace at all. Peace is not the result of a one-sided effort, but a relationship between members of an international community which, observing the rules of justice, cooperate for the collective welfare in mutual understanding.

Deep changes have been wrought in the life of nations. They are very closely interdependent. They have at their disposal an immense potential



for offensive war. In view of these considerations, the tranquil security of order cannot be attained except on a collective basis. In addition, any peaceful co-existence of nations requires a certain balance between the members of international society, in a way which will exclude any disproportion induced by violence. So long as an important and considerable sector of international society refuses to observe the rules of justice and charity, and refuses to cooperate in mutual understanding and harmony, there can, therefore, be no hope for true peace, for peaceful co-existence. In such a case, there is even less hope for organizing the international community, because such a community presupposes the establishment and maintenance of an order of justice and charity, the realization of the common international good.

Christians have to care for more than the improvement of social conditions. Their duty to promote peace in the international society cannot lead them to forget the higher obligations of human life. Above the earthly values of material improvement of human conditions and those of prosperity, there are the values of religion and civilization. These values concern man's relationship to God and to the supernatural order, and his freedom to develop that relationship. Christians have—above all—the duty to see to it that the message of Christ is preached to each in-

dividual, and that no obstacle stands in the way of the freedom of fellow Christians to discharge this duty. A Christian—especially a Christian of this century—is responsible not only for his immediate neighbors and for those who live with him in the same national community or state; his solidarity must extend to all Christians living in the same international society. He must take care for the freedom of all mankind, because if freedom is endangered anywhere, it is endangered everywhere.

### IS PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE POSSIBLE?

Can there be true peace or peaceful co-existence between the Communist bloc of powers and the non-Communist world? To answer this question, it is not enough to ascertain the peaceful intentions of the non-Communist world. Peaceful co-existence will depend mainly on the intentions of the Communist bloc of powers. It is true that the successors of Stalin are repeatedly declaring their peaceful aims and their conviction that a peaceful co-existence of the two worlds can be maintained for a prolonged period. Yet, the main question is: what credence can a Christian give to these declarations?

Let us suppose for a moment that peaceful co-existence is possible between the two worlds. What price would Christians have to pay for peaceful co-existence with the Com-

munist bloc of powers? There is no doubt that the Communist bloc of powers would demand that the free world renounce all effort toward liberating those nations which Soviet Russia conquered by military means. Suppose that the free world would accept this condition, would, in short, accept the international *status quo*. What would that mean? It would mean no less than to acquiesce in the complete de-Christianization of at least one-sixth of the Christian world. Every day of such peaceful co-existence would mean that more and more young people would be forced or persuaded to break their ties with the Christian faith and the civilization of the West. It would mean continued slavery, deportation and death for those who cling to the Christian traditions and spiritual heritage. It would mean a loss of hope behind the Iron Curtain; for it would be equivalent to the acceptance and recognition of the Soviet order. It would mean that Christians of the free world consider more important the lifting of the standard of living in their own countries than the restitution of freedom, basic human rights and especially religious freedom to the nations behind the Iron Curtain.

What would be the consequence of such an abandonment of Christians under the Soviet yoke? In the next generation the Christians of the free world would face many more problems in order to live up to their

principles than they have to face today. Every century poses tremendous tasks and burdens on the shoulders of Christian people. The unsolved tasks of preceding centuries accumulate and exact tremendous interests to be paid by subsequent generations. If Christians on the shores of the Mediterranean had been saved from Moslem expansion during the ten centuries following the death of Mohammed, if the unity of the Christian world had not been destroyed by the schism and Reformation, if the defection of the working classes from the church had been averted during the period of early capitalism, Christians today could more easily solve their problems. Undoubtedly the danger of Communism would not have attained its current proportions if Christians of preceding generations had handled their problems with courage and solidarity.

#### CHRISTIAN SOLIDARITY

If, today, the Christian world neglects the liberation of its brethren living under the Soviet yoke, not only will it bear great responsibility for this loss, but, proportionally, the world will have fewer Christians in the following generation. The bitter burdens of the errors and neglects of today will fall upon the Christians of tomorrow.

Assuming that such a lack of Christian solidarity should allow the non-Communist world to agree to the

terms of peaceful co-existence with the Communist bloc of powers, can the free world secure for itself, even for this generation, any genuine peaceful co-existence? In other words, can the non-Communist world be sure of the peaceful intentions of Communist leaders?

There is no doubt that Stalin's successors are making all sorts of peaceful declarations. Their statements are even accompanied by some unessential concessions and friendly gestures, such as easing the regulations for visiting certain territories in Russia, or partly abolishing traffic restrictions in Austria. But we must remind you that Soviet spokesmen have been issuing such statements and declarations off and on for more than twenty-five years *without altering the essentials of their doctrine and without renouncing their final aim: the conquest of the whole world.*

On September 9, 1952, *Pravda* noted the twenty-fifth anniversary of Stalin's statement that "peaceful co-existence" was possible between the Communist and non-Communist worlds. During these twenty-five years, Stalin himself returned several times to the tune of peaceful co-existence. On April 9, 1947, in an interview with Harold Stassen he emphatically reasserted that "there was not a single party congress or plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party at which I did or could have said that cooperation between

the two systems was impossible." Yet during these twenty-five years Communism has extended its power from Russia to one-third of the world's population. How can we assume today, when statements similar to those of Stalin are uttered by the present leaders of Communism, that co-existence will have any other results?

### "PARTIAL WAR"

Still the objection might be raised that since there has been no all-out, open and formal war between the Communist and the non-Communist world during the thirty-six years of Communist power in Russia, peaceful co-existence between the two systems is possible. The reply is that the free world can have no assurance that such a war will not occur in the future. If the Communist leaders have not yet launched an all-out, open war, it is simply due to the fact that the conditions set by Lenin are not yet fulfilled. Lenin said: "As soon as we are strong enough to defeat capitalism as a whole, we shall immediately take it by the scruff of the neck" (Speech to Moscow Party Nuclei Secretaries, November 26, 1920. *Selected Works*, 1943, Vol. VII, p. 282). And why should the Communist leaders have launched such a full-scale war when by their methods of "partial war" they have succeeded in expanding the hold of the Communist empire over one-third of the world?



The same Stalin who voiced the peaceful declarations stated in the political report of the Central Committee to the 15th Congress of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union that "the war with the capitalist countries . . . is inevitable, but we must delay it either until proletarian revolution ripens in Europe, until colonial revolutions come fully to a head, or finally, until the capitalists fight among themselves" (Dec. 3, 1927, *Sochineniya*, Vol. 10, 1949, pp. 288-289).

The Communist leaders are not afraid of launching a war. Stalin admitted it openly in his letter to Gorky (1930): "We are not against every war. We are against an imperialist war as a counter-revolutionary war. But we are for a liberating anti-imperialist revolutionary war, although such a war, as it is well-known, is not only not free from the 'horrors' of bloodshed but abounds in them" (*Sochineniya*, Vol. 12, 1949, p. 176).

The peace-slogans used by Kremlin leaders must be further interpreted in the light of Stalin's own words at the 6th Congress of the Communist International: "The peace policy of the proletarian state certainly does not imply that the Soviet state has become reconciled to capitalism. . . . It is merely another, and under present conditions, more advantageous form of fighting capitalism" ("Measures of Struggle against the Dangers of Im-

perialist Wars; Theses"—*Kommunisticheskie International v Dokumentakh*, 1919-1932, Moscow, 1933, pp. 810-811).

Even the word peace is used differently by the Communist and the non-Communist world. Non-Communists mean by peace not only the absence of hostilities, but also the existence of harmony and mutual concord and the absence of fears. For a Communist, as long as he remains Communist, such a peace cannot exist until the day of the final proletarian victory. As he sees it, there can be no true peace until the final achievement of a classless society. If Communists use the term peace, it means for them that in the ever-present conflict between the Communist and the non-Communist world methods short of all-out war are employed. They believe that the intra-nation class war has now broadened into an international class struggle between the have and the have-not nations. Within this framework, there is always something of what Lenin occasionally called "partial war."

If the Communist leaders profess belief in peaceful co-existence for an indefinite (yet, according to their faith, very finite) period, this "proceeds organically from the very nature of our state and from the Leninist-Stalinist teaching about the co-existence of the two systems," ■■■ Kaganovich said in 1950. And what is the nature of these teachings? The

victory of Communism will come at different times in different places because of the unevenness of social development in various countries. Until the victory is general, it follows that the Communist and non-Communist world in various forms must co-exist. Until the final liquidation of the non-Communist world, Communists must "tack, maneuver and compromise" as Lenin had taught them.

### WORLD DOMINATION

Communism has never renounced its purpose of world domination. No peaceful slogans used by the present leaders of Soviet Russia can veil the tremendous fact that the Communist Empire and the Communist-dominated countries use more than half of their national income for armaments. The death of Stalin may compel the new regime in Russia to make some concessions to its own subjects. Malenkov and his group are badly in need of time to build up their prestige. For that reason, they may prefer for an intermediate period a slow-down of the rearmament race. Yet the very fact that they have never relinquished their final aim of world conquest makes it unthinkable that the Soviets will accept any genuine international inspection of their vast armament industry or even one part of it, such as the atomic energy industry. Without altering the nature and the basis of the Communist system, the Communist leaders of Soviet Russia and

China will never agree to international control over their armament effort.

Should the non-Communist world anywhere show any weakness, partial or even open, an all-out war will break out if Communist leaders believe they have a chance to gain at least a part of the world to their side. Stalin even predicted ("Foundation of Leninism," April, 1924, *Problems of Leninism*, Hungarian Edition, Budapest, 1945, p. 29) where such a war will erupt next. It is not necessarily, he said, where industry is more advanced, but where the chain of imperialism is the weakest. "Where will the chain break in the nearest future? Once again, where it is the weakest. It is not to be excluded that the chain may break, let us say, in India. . . . It is possible . . . also that the chain will break in Germany. . . ."

How can the non-Communist world be sure of peaceful co-existence, even for the length of one generation, if it is evident that the Communist leaders are only watching for the weaknesses, the weak spots and weak moments, of the non-Communist world, prepared to drive upon it with un-controlled armaments. How can the free world be sure of enjoying the benefits of a one-generation-long peaceful period when it knows that the present leaders of Soviet Russia are faithful disciples of Lenin, who stated bluntly enough that "As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live

in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph—a funeral dirge will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism” (Speech to Moscow Party Nuclei Secretaries, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, New York, 1943, vol. VIII., p. 297).

#### LENIN TO MALENKOV

Can the free world forget that the present leaders are but following the advice of Stalin, according to which “the object of the party is to exploit all and any conflicting interests among the surrounding capitalist groups and governments with the view to the disintegration of capitalism”? (“The Party before and after the Seizure of Power,” *Pravda*, No. 190, August 28, 1921. *Sochineniya*, Cospolitizdat, Moscow, 1947, vol. V. p. 111.)

Should the non-Communist world not recall the statement of Stalin on the Soviet’s Economy and World Affairs made in October, 1952, in which he only repeated what was emphasized in his book, *The Foundation of Leninism* (April, 1924), that Communism must avoid an all-out war only to await the sharpening of revolutionary conflicts within the capitalistic countries themselves as well as the sharpening of the conflict in the colonies, the increase of the nationalist movements against the colonizing powers and the inevitable wars between imperialistic powers greedily competing for the world markets?

Should one of these eventualities materialize, no one can doubt that the present leaders of Soviet Russia will put into effect the teaching of Stalin: “. . . The advancement and support of the revolution in other countries is the essential task of a victorious revolution. Therefore, the victorious revolution of a country cannot consider itself as a unity for itself, but as a support, as a means to speed the victory of the proletariat in other countries” (*The Foundation of Leninism*, p. 35). And until this moment arrives, Soviet Communism cannot refrain from interference in the non-Communist world. Lenin regarded his victories in Russia as only the first steps toward world Communism. And there is no sign that this essential part of Communist doctrine evolved by Marx, Lenin and Stalin has been rejected by the present leaders of world Communism. On the contrary, Malenkov stated at the funeral of Stalin: “Our party adheres to the great teaching of Marxism and Leninism which furnishes the party and the people with the invincible strength and ability to blaze new paths in history” (New York, *Times*, March 10, 1953).

#### PREPARING FOR WAR

The peaceful declarations of the Soviet leaders have only one aim: to paralyse the will and power of their opponents long enough to complete the build-up of Soviet power.



Paralysis of the opponents' will and power is to be induced by peace-propaganda and by divisive tactics of all sorts. Behind the facade of peaceful slogans, the present Soviet leaders, just as Lenin and Stalin did, are preparing war, are preparing world conquest. Under these circumstances, it is futile to hope for peaceful co-existence, even for the length of one generation. Any Christian who forgets the hard facts of Soviet policy and prefers to believe the peace slogans for mass consumption deceives himself and betrays the community to which he belongs. He does not serve the security of his own fatherland and, as a final reward, will not even enjoy the benefits of the peace for which he is longing.

### THE PROSPECT

There is, by way of summary, hardly any prospect for peaceful co-existence of the Communist bloc of powers with the non-Communist world. The intention to have such peaceful co-existence is lacking on the Communist side. Much less, therefore, is there any hope of building an international community so long as the world is divided into two blocs. No international community can be constructed without an order of justice and charity, without respecting the highest values of the community and of individual human dignity and with-

out striving to realize the common international good. Communism denies the highest values of the free world. It aims, not at the common international good, but only and essentially at one objective: to make the whole world Communist. So there is an unremitting and irreconcilable antithesis between the two worlds. Lenin was perspicacious enough to foresee this fundamental opposition when he prophesied that a "funeral dirge will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

Is there then no hope for an international community? We believe firmly that there is. There are two ways to realize it. One is the Communist way. If Communism overwhelms the free world, it will establish its own international community: the classless society of the victorious proletariat, as they call it. But there is another way, too. It is the way of Christian solidarity: the victory of justice and charity—as we understand them. And if the Christian living in the temporal order will be courageous enough not only to preach the order of justice and charity, but put it into practice too, there is no doubt that charity will eventually triumph over hate, and justice over injustice. For there is no more attractive and more cohesive force than the practice and example of true Christian love.

# Your Holy Family

FRANCIS L. FILAS, S.J.  
*Loyola University, Chicago*

*Reprinted from THE VOICE OF ST. JUDE\**

**I**S IT possible for the modern American family to live as once there lived the Holy Family of Nazareth?

God gave us the all-time picture of the perfect family. The frustrating and almost irritating fact is that the example of this family has been wasted for so many Catholic couples. They are afraid to claim Jesus, Mary and Joseph as their own. No, they are not disrespectful; they have what might be called too much respect. They imagine Jesus, Mary and Joseph as three plaster Saints living a rigid existence called perfection, free from contact with the world around them, intent only on saying prayers, and, in general, shall we say, not very lovable.

Actually, the three holiest ones have led the way on the one road of family perfection—the road to genuine holiness that means happiness. That has made them more rather than less lovable. Perhaps some saints have been difficult to live with; while striving for heroic virtue, they may have failed to integrate their holiness with all sides of their character. But

this could not and did not happen in the case of the Holy Family.

Jesus Himself possessed human nature at its ultimate best. The Gospels record the tremendous attraction He exercised over men and women of His time—and over children, too, let us not forget! His virgin mother by the very fact she was His mother became the closest reflection of His love. His virgin father was chosen by God from among millions of men, as the only man worthy to exercise fatherly rights and fatherly love over God on earth.

Despite the fleeting Gospel references to the Holy Family in their hidden life, we are sure of one “family fact”: Jesus, Mary and Joseph were accepted as ordinary people by their neighbors. *Therefore*, they must have had neighborly traits, and they were anything but tight-lipped hermits.

We find it hard, it is true, to bridge the gap of 2,000 years between us and the Holy Family. Even so, the mere distance in time does not seem to be the main reason for disbelieving their likeableness. The hesitancy to follow

\* 221 W. Madison St., Chicago 16, Ill., January, 1954

them seems to arise from a different source. Perhaps this is largely the cause: Joseph and Mary were virginal husband and virginal wife; how can they be looked on as models for couples who use their marital rights?

I know from experience that this objection has done its discouraging work. I remember a meeting of high-minded Catholic husbands and wives which was organized to stimulate the best happiness and holiness in Christian married life. One of the promoters said in so many words that the example of the Holy Family did not apply to the average married couple. Joseph and Mary were virginal—so his ideas ran—and a fruitful marriage cannot be virginal, and, to put it bluntly, the Holy Family example should be played down!

A person with such an attitude is ashamed to set Joseph and Mary before the modern couple as their most worthy model. He has fallen into an error bordering on a pagan philosophy of marriage. He contradicts the constant teaching of modern popes, notably Leo XIII, that the Holy Family is an example for *all* people in *all* walks of life. He has lost sight of what is essential in every marriage: namely, the marriage contract, the spiritual union between husband and wife whereby their wills become one. He is confused as to the meaning of the "example" of Joseph and Mary, and he cannot see how the love of such a virginal couple can be an ideal

for married couples who symbolize their love for each other in physical union.

### GOD-GIVEN VOCATION

To explain the facts: We must accept the truth that Joseph and Mary were husband and wife, united in a valid marriage contract. That is the clear teaching and the unanimous Catholic interpretation of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. But Joseph and Mary were not an ordinary husband and wife. They were also the two saints of saints who lived out the duties of their God-given vocation in a way no other couple has ever approached. Joseph was the perfect husband; Mary was the perfect wife. No human could be closer to Mary's heart than St. Joseph; no human could be more the object of Joseph's devotion than his wife Mary. Both of them would have been failing in their marriage obligations if their love for each other had been otherwise.

The fact that Mary was the virgin Mother of God did not hinder the love she bore toward St. Joseph. Her love as well as her virginity were both included in the divine plan when God chose to be born of a woman who was both a virgin and a wife.

The ultimate reason for Mary's virginity must be sought in this plan of God. When the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity was to take on Himself our human nature, it was



completely *possible* that He *might* have been generated by a human father, as are all ordinary children. In such a case—in our way of speaking—the Eternal Father would have shared His natural fatherhood of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity with one of His creatures, St. Joseph.

However, in such a scheme it would have been most difficult for humans to accept the divinity of Jesus. In order to make it easier for us to believe in Christ's godhead, the Eternal Father reserved His natural fatherhood to Himself. In other words, Jesus was born of a virgin mother, and St. Joseph became father of Jesus spiritually, not physically—that is, in all respects except physical generation. The spiritual or moral bonds between Joseph and Jesus were the same that link a natural father to the son he has begotten, but the physical relationship was absent because Joseph did not generate Jesus. Jesus was given to Joseph because of and through Mary, who was Joseph's wife.

#### BORN OF A VIRGIN MOTHER

This brings us to the reason why Jesus was born of a virgin mother who was also a wife. God followed His own law. From the moment of man's creation God had willed that all children should be conceived and should be born within the bonds of the family. Children were to come into the world and were to be re-

ceived by the parents to whom they belonged. So it happened even in the case of the Holy Family. Jesus was conceived within Mary—miraculously, of course, but none the less He was given in this way to St. Joseph's family. He was not an adopted child; He belonged to the parents to whom He had been miraculously given.

There is still another reason why Jesus was born within a family. Jesus wished to live our life as completely as possible. He was to be like us in all things, sin alone excepted. That is why He would need food, clothing and shelter like any other child. Most of all, like any other child He would need the love of a father and mother. Mary and Joseph were the two souls divinely chosen to lavish motherly and fatherly love on God Himself in human form.

Such is the explanation why Jesus was born of a married virgin. It also shows why the marriage between Joseph and Mary had to be virginal. Mary's body was reserved for God alone, to give Him alone His human nature. There was to be no other child of Mary.

Joseph's vocation like Mary's was simply without parallel—the only one of its kind. There was certainly no looking askance at marriage as such, certainly no disdain of God's plan for human reproduction. God had called these two to be united in a true marriage union, even though

they would voluntarily not use the rights they had. Their marriage, alone of all marriages, was to receive and rear the Son of God in its midst.

### MARRIAGE RIGHTS

Clear thinking is imperative when marriage rights are mentioned. Unless these *rights* are mutually given, no true marriage can exist. The marriage union must be potentially fruitful. At least potentially it must be oriented toward the propagation of the human race, even if it never becomes actually fruitful.

However, the *use* of marriage rights is not the same as the rights themselves. If this were so, marriage would be pulled down from the spiritual level it occupies and would be practically equal to the mating of brutes. But it is not a mere animal mating. It is—we must repeat—first ■ union of the souls of two human beings, whereby husband and wife give to each other the right to symbolize their love, the mutual belonging. This symbolism can then occur by means of sexual actions that tend to reproduce the race.

In every marriage where the marital privilege is exchanged, the physical action loses its full meaning if the spiritual bond of love between husband and wife is weak. For that matter, any physical action of itself has no value unless it is given a meaning. We shake hands, we nod our heads, we smile, we give gifts, we

speak amiably. All these are signs that indicate friendship. If the friendship is not in existence, then the action has no meaning, no symbolism.

The same situation exists between husband and wife. If they have a deep love for each other, if they spiritually belong to each other, then the physical symbols of their love will have their full meaning and will in turn deepen the love already there. It is in this way, I suggest, that the Catholic husband and wife, united in the social sacrament of Matrimony can and should turn to Joseph and Mary for example. The tremendously close union of souls between the father and mother in the Holy Family is the goal which every Catholic husband and wife should look to. If they attain success in imitating such love, they will find that their true love shows itself in *every* aspect of their life together.

One final point should be explained: When the Church proposes a model for our imitation, an exemplar to inspire us, this does not mean that such an exemplar must have lived a life completely like our own. As a matter of fact, no two persons have ever had the same heredity and environment, the same talents or temperament, the same health or wealth or social standing, even the same supernatural graces. No one should be copied slavishly because no one *can* be copied slavishly. Each of us must *apply* the lessons of an exemplar to

the individual conditions in which we live.

So in the case of Joseph and Mary. They are models for all people in all walks of life, but persons of different vocations will draw different lessons from their lives.

Love if it is genuine is something selfless. It is a wishing well, a desire to obtain the greatest benefits for the welfare of the beloved. True love wants to give. In the instance of

Christ our Lord, we know how His love brought Him down to our earth, led Him to live among us, finally to give up His life after He gave us Himself in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist.

That same love of the Sacred Heart of Jesus found its closest imitation in the hearts of Mary and Joseph. May they be generously copied by Mr. and Mrs. Catholic of our times and all times.



### *Visit of the Magi*

Who were these men who came from the East to adore Christ? Most probably they were Persian priests and prophets, members of the sacred caste—the Magi—who had ruled the Medes until they were stripped of political power by the emperor Cyrus about 600 B. C. But though the Magi were no longer kings by the time Christ was born, their religious influence—as interpreters of the holy books and as expert astrologers—was still strong in the lands to the east of Judea. The Magi believed that every good man was made up of two selves: one which walked the earth and another which moved as a star in the heavens. These two selves were ultimately reunited in death. When a star more brilliant than any they had known appeared in the heavens, therefore, the Magi took it as a sign that a person of great importance had been born into the world. Further, since at the time Christ was born there was probably a Jewish population in Persia, the scholarly Magi were familiar with God's promise that He would send His chosen people a Messiah. Moreover, the writings of such famous Romans as Horace, Virgil and Tacitus testify that throughout the Empire at that time there was a general unrest, an expectation of a Golden Age to be ushered in by the birth of a great deliverer. All these factors played their parts in influencing the Magi to follow the star westward across the desert. — *R. L. R. in JUBILEE, January, 1955.*



# The Catholic's Role in Scientific Psychology

THE REV. CHARLES A. CURRAN, PH.D.

*Presidential address to the American Catholic Psychological Association,  
Fordham University, September 7, 1954*

TO CLAIM to be able to define the Catholic's role in psychology in a short talk would certainly be presumptuous. Obviously, the Catholic psychologist has an excellent opportunity to present and interpret psychological findings and services in a way most readily acceptable to his fellow Catholics. At the same time, too, he is in an equally excellent position—when it is desired—to present and interpret Catholicity to his fellow scientists. Both these roles of interpretation and clarification, while readily apparent, are none the less extremely important.

It seems fitting, however, in a technical group like our own, to inquire more deeply into some issues which face us. Moreover, what is said here directly referring to Catholic psychologists can also, in a more general way, be applied to all Catholic scientists.

Catholic psychologists, and to some degree perhaps all Catholics in sciences, are the object of what the social psychologist might call a "two-fold stereotype." A stereotype has been defined as a reaction people have to

a person, situation, or subject, pre-determined by ready-made pictures in their minds. These stereotypes can often so distort a person's view that it is difficult for him to make clear discriminations, with the result that his real understanding of a subject is seriously impeded.

Otto Klineberg and others have been making us conscious of the degree to which stereotypes widely affect human reaction. We are aware, for example, of the simple experiment in which a person was shown a picture of a white man and a Negro, standing together—the white man having an open razor in his hand. The content of the picture was then to be described to another person, who in turn described it to a third, etc. By the time the description had reached the tenth person, in fifty per cent of the cases the razor had left the hand of the white man and was in the hand of the Negro. The strength of the stereotype which associated Negro and open razor proved to be a powerful influence in the distortion of even so simple a picture. Stereotyped attitudes, therefore, can often cause a

normally intelligent person either to fail to see the facts or unintentionally to distort them.

Catholic psychologists, too, can in something of the same way be the object of a two-fold stereotype: the one from those Catholics who sometimes tend to suspect everything psychological, the other from those scientists who may tend to suspect that Catholics cannot be true scientists. One of our main roles as Catholic psychologists is, I believe, to help clarify both of these possible misunderstandings.

In the misunderstanding coming sometimes from fellow Catholics, our approach must be one of kindness and patience. Here a group approach, such as that represented by our own association, is especially important and effective. Our fellow Catholics, even those considered highly educated, cannot be expected to understand as a specialist does the intricacies and varieties of psychological viewpoints and research. We must with patience, kindness and good-will explain over and over again the real points involved: the meaning of our science at its best, our place in it as Catholics, the ideal toward which we strive.

We can do this by personal contact, by good manners in debate and discussion. We can do it also by something we may be too prone to overlook and neglect—by a good press. Conferences, like our own here today, are news, usually with pictures. Peo-

ple read this news—learned, educated people as well as the ordinary reader. All are affected in some manner by the newspaper version. Therefore it is our responsibility to try for good, accurate press releases. Excellent conferences often take place that no one hears about because no one went to the trouble to prepare news releases in advance or to inform the press. Here a false pride can be very misleading because it robs our fellow Catholics of information that could be valuable and helpful to them.

### NO FEAR OF TRUE SCIENCE

There is, of course, from the point of view of the Church no conflict between religion and science. We have the strong statement of Pius XI in his encyclical on the priesthood that "the Church has no fear of progress, even the most daring progress, of science, if only it be true science." Pius XII has addressed discourses to scientists generally and to psychologists and psychotherapists in particular.

These and other statements that could be quoted all reaffirm the basic importance in modern times of scientific training and also, as a specialty, training in psychology. In a scientific culture like our own, it would be tragic were Catholics, because they are Catholics, to refrain from sharing, understanding, learning from and contributing to scientific development and research. Nothing could be more fatal

for the future of our Judaeo-Christian civilization, and even for the future of the Church itself. In those few periods in history, as at the end of the Middle Ages, when churchmen for the most part lost touch with the new developments of the age, tragic consequences followed, not only for the position and influence of the Church, but for the whole of our civilization. The terrible effects of the cleavage this produced in our culture have not yet been entirely effaced. There can be no question then of the value and importance of Catholics participating in scientific fields.

One of the most significant contributions that we as Catholic psychologists can make to our fellow Catholics is therefore to show ourselves, singly and in our joint associations, true and sincere followers and respecters of our science without being any the less true and sincere followers and respecters of our religion. As our fellow Catholics grow increasingly to understand that this is possible, they will grow increasingly respectful of our psychological science, its value and its possible contributions to their individual lives.

### SCIENCE AND RELIGION

The second stereotype facing us comes from our scientific and, in particular, our psychological colleagues. Some seem to feel that no Catholic, or even sometimes no sincerely religious person, can be a true scientist.

Like most stereotypes, the exact origin and development of this attitude is difficult to trace. It has been held for a long time, due to the broader confusion about the relation of religion and science, and is therefore strongly reinforced. Consequently, to use Tolman's terms, discrimination and scanning by which a new understanding can be acquired will of necessity be all the more difficult.

The responsibility rests with us to supply to our psychological colleagues information and joint experience with us which will aid them, where such aid is necessary, to see more clearly how our being Catholics in no way impinges on our scientific integrity—but rightly understood, reinforces it. As scientists we must be true to the demands of our science. If we speak the scientific language they understand, and if we seek truth with scientific thoroughness, honesty, integrity and humility, our colleagues will recognize this and respect it. There is certainly a place in American science for the true scientist who also has strong religious convictions. He can and should live by these convictions without in any way forsaking the rigor and integrity of his science.

One word sometimes associated with this stereotyped objection that Catholics cannot be true scientists is "authoritarian." As an objection, it has in its current usage strongly emotionalized tones. Semantically, "authoritarian" used in this emotion-



al way implies some rigid, unreasonable and autocratic control that warps, distorts, or prevents human freedom. But let us examine it more carefully.

### SCIENTIFIC LIBERTY

"Authoritarian," in itself, means that in some way one person is subject to some authority in at least a limited and well-defined way. In this sense, all Americans, for example, are subject to the Supreme Court, all university professors to the Board of Trustees and Faculty, students to professors, and all employes to their employers. To these kinds of authorities, all psychologists, as well as all Americans, are themselves subject. Now surely no one claims that since we psychologists are subject to these authorities, we cannot be true psychologists. Why then should the religious authority of the Church, in matters very carefully defined and clearly understood, make us any the less worthy to be true psychologists?

Moreover, on closer examination it appears that the protection of personal as well as scientific liberty resides in authority and not in a confused adherence to complete license. "Liberty is obedience to just law" is one of those tradition-hallowed statements that we see on many public buildings.

Liberty consists in obedience to rightful authority. Pure anarchy, with no authority, has always produced such a state of disorder and confusion

that even the elemental right of life itself is in jeopardy. No freedom—either of science or anything else—is possible in such absence of authority. For all our liberty, scientific as well as personal, we must have authorities and be subject to them in well defined spheres. But such authorities, be they political, economic, religious, or otherwise, if they be justly and reasonably defined, and carefully delineated and executed, in no way threaten or endanger our liberty as free men or as scientists. On the contrary they are the surest safeguard of this liberty by preserving in balanced harmony the rights and duties, the just prerogatives and wise restrictions which enable us to live in union with each other as citizens of this world and the next.

But perhaps a further core question involved here is that of the scientific method itself. For some the phrase "to be scientific" seems to imply a vague removal from or denial of all values not subject to the narrow confines of certain experimental or mathematical validation. This attitude sometimes even implies the extreme view that everything not immediately developed by the present methods of science and, in human relations, of psychology, is somehow subject to grave doubts or even disrepute.

Consider how in popular English the word scientific always implies materialistic science, and how the word "unscientific" has become widely ac-

cepted as synonymous with "false, useless, inferior, to be disregarded", etc. Doctor Vannevar Bush, himself certainly a scientist of wide repute, warns us that this attitude, promoted by Communism, has really led to "a police state, dominated by a tight oligarchy and bent on conquest. Its central characteristic is its materialism. It takes the teachings of science, as it sees them, and applies them to its program. In the name of that science it denies all decency between men."

Actually it is not true that science must exclude all other values but materialism. This is not science at all. As Bush explains: "The whole affair is a ghastly fallacy. Science has been misread. Science does not exclude faith. And faith alone can meet the threat that now hangs over us. Science does not teach a harsh materialism. It does not teach anything at all beyond its boundaries, and those boundaries are severely limited by science itself."

Certainly many things absolutely essential to our civilization, to our liberty, to all that we love and hold dear are "unscientific" in the sense that Dr. Bush has expressed—in the sense that science is most limited in its field and its conclusions. To be rigorously scientific in research and experimentation is rare and difficult. In fact, for this very reason, the social scientists generally, and psychologists in particular, have yet to be

fully accepted as scientific by their colleagues in other scientific fields.

### THE HUMAN PERSON

Psychology is, fortunately, coming into maturity when science itself is much humbler now than in the boastful days of its own youth. In physics the vast research in recent years, ending in Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, makes no longer tenable a glib and simple mechanical determinism. This is all the more true when dealing with such a highly complex and variable subject of investigation as the human person itself.

Here most of all the scientist must be humble and cautious—with the humility and caution of the expert surgeon who cuts only to cure and aid, never to destroy; and who never removes before establishing surely that the organ or tissue is not worth saving or is, in fact, injurious. The danger of psychology, like the danger of rashness of anything young, is to rush in, destroy quickly, because it thinks it has a vision of a new world—a new concept of scientific personality—that sadly has never been given any careful testing and measuring itself. So it is not the true scientist that we need be cautious of, but the visionary, the apostle with a psychological cause, who quickly turns a possible psychological hypothesis—as yet untested and only vaguely defined—into a philosophy and a way of life—if you will, into a religion.

Stated simply, one could say, I believe, that there are two things a scientist needs: the freedom to face facts and the freedom to proceed by scientific doubt as a method of investigation. Part of the stereotyped objection is to imply that this critical doubt as a method of scientific investigation came into being for the first time in the seventeenth century. Catholic civilization and culture, they say, could never have produced it. But is this true? Well, actually it is not. We find this conception of the critical doubt in Aristotle, and we find it repeated again very clearly by St. Thomas. In his *Metaphysics*, Aristotle remarked: "We should enter the chambers of knowledge through the portals of doubt . . . by making preliminary examination of the difficulties to be solved." In his explanatory notes on the passage, Aquinas says:

If a person is tied up and wants to free himself, the first thing he does is to examine his bonds carefully in order to determine what kind of knot is holding him. Similarly, if one wants to get to the bottom of a problem he should first consider its attendant difficulties and their causes. . . . Trying to reach the truth of a matter without formulating a critical doubt is like going on a journey without an objective. . . . If one arrives at a specific goal, it is only by the faintest sort of chance.

The scientific method of the critical doubt then is as old as our Graeco-Christian tradition. It is not this method itself which is really at

issue. Rather it is two contrasting theories of procedure. In a recent article in the *Scientific Monthly*, June 1954, a fellow psychologist, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, says:

The present known facts in heredity already make it seem foolish in religious, moral, or esthetic fields to believe that each new generation can disregard all the painfully evolved experience and wisdom of the past. . . . In summary, therefore, if we are to try to glimpse even some aspects of an elusive cosmos through the chaos of our times, is it not true that we must give full emphasis to all that is valid in the natural sciences and in the social sciences and the applied fields and professions that are related to these areas of study? Above all, however, it would be well to recognize more fully than we have in recent years the importance of vital instruction in the studies that record the most sensitive and subtle solutions of human problems as recorded in all the fields of study we call the humanities.

The methods of learning about values in art, literature, philosophy and religion are not in all respects the same as those of science. In some of these studies, emotions and attitudes of appreciation and feeling, as well as logic, must be exercised. Thus, at least some of the perceptive members of each generation will gain, as in no other way, an inner enlightened understanding of the personal and social values that have always characterized man at his best and noblest (*Scientific Monthly*, June, 1954, pp. 372-9).

The point that Dr. Carmichael here raises of the tendency among some scientists to show a tragic disregard of all the painfully evolved wisdom



and experience of the past involves, I believe, a basic difference in the understanding and use of the scientific method itself. It is in fact this very point of the Catholic scientist's respect for the experience and wisdom of the past that is sometimes turned into the stereotyped objection that he cannot be a true scientist.

### SCIENTIFIC ICONOCLASM

The theory of what might be called scientific iconoclasm proceeds on the vague assumption, as Carmichael points out, that unless we wipe the blackboard clean, so to speak, we will not arrive at truth. This theory seems always to be beginning anew—to consider either as worthless, or of as much less significant, the work that has preceded it. Of course, as a matter of fact, this never happens. All research workers who have contributed anything significant would be the first to admit that they are greatly dependent on their predecessors, many of whom have extended away back through the centuries. But there is still the assumption that somehow the past has comparatively little to contribute and we must not admit any dependence on it, in any precise and detailed way.

If we remove the obvious ego-satisfactions from such a point of view, we can see that it completely walls off such a scientist from the past and leaves him isolated and cut off from his roots. As a member of Western

civilization, he is an inheritor of the Judaeo-Christian tradition and he is ultimately profiting by the centuries of fulfillment of that civilization. But such scientific iconoclasm destroys the sources of our civilization in the very process of attempting to make something finer.

The second point of view proceeds by a different way of understanding the method of scientific doubt and the facing of facts. If, by way of simple common sense, we take the example of a man who, after he has built a house, calls an inspector to examine it to see if it is sound and safe, we may arrive at a little different conclusion.

The inspector has from his experience and intelligence a realization that there are methods of testing the soundness of the house, the strength of its walls and its ultimate stability, security and safety, without at the same time destroying any of the worthwhile things in the house. The inspector proceeds by methods which, while they throw into doubt each individual phase of the house for the purpose of testing it, yet ultimately have a basic assumption behind them that the house itself is sound; that while there may be here or there one or the other aspect that needs correction or support, or even to be removed and a better product substituted, the whole house is fundamentally sound and will stand.

That is the assumption on which

the inspector proceeds. He does not, in order to examine the house, reduce it to shambles so that there is not even a stone left of it. No, it is not necessary to do that for a valid evaluation.

So the Catholic scientist, by reason of being Catholic, does not in any way remove from himself his ability to face facts and proceed by way of the critical doubt. St. Thomas makes that very clear, if we need to quote a long-standing representative of the best Catholic thought on the matter, or need to demonstrate that this view was true of the Catholic scientists even in the thirteenth century.

#### JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN TRADITION

But the difference is the same common-sense approach of the inspector who examines the house and tests it thoroughly but in such a way that he keeps a conscious respect for the integrity of the house and its ability to stand solid in the midst of that examination. The Catholic scientist proceeds with a deep respect for our Judaeo-Christian tradition. When he devises methods that enable him to make an intelligent inquiry into a particular area of research, he does so in such a way that he leaves open and clear the likely possibility and assumption that the basic postulates of our civilization and its Judaeo-Christian view of man are sound ones; that the basic metaphysic on which our society has been founded is a realistic metaphysic and will

hold up amidst all the skillful investigation of an intelligent mind. Such methods serve to reveal in a new light and under a new aspect the marvelous strength and wisdom that went into the formulation of what we now have.

As a result, the Catholic scientist generally, and the psychologist particularly, are very close to the developments of modern science and, at the same time, equally close to our forebears and to the long tradition of Judaeo-Christian civilization. As Catholics we are not representative of an alien tradition, as some even now seem confusedly to think. Rather, it is our tradition—that of Western civilization at its best and fullest—which through a long and difficult process of thought and action has produced both democracy and science themselves. We are at home therefore in the products of this tradition. We represent one of its deepest and strongest impulses, the impulse for truth, the impulse for facing the facts and the impulse for the intelligent doubt.

Our culture, especially in America, is learning again the painful necessity of leaving a place for the believing scientist. A civilization like ours which is basically Judaeo-Christian, and at the same time engaged in a test of survival for which scientists are absolutely essential, must provide in its democratic philosophy a place both for a true scientist and a true religious person. If we fail to do

this, we may end by implying that all scientists must be absolute materialists: exponents of the very philosophy with which we are in conflict as a nation in the free world. It would be tragically misleading, therefore, for our American culture, and for American science, if we were to allow the impression to perdure that Catholics, and religious men generally, cannot be true scientists—that somehow we must destroy our culture to be truly scientific.

The magnificent vision of the

Greeks, Medievalists and the men of the Renaissance was to see the highest achievements of human reason joined harmoniously with the heights of Divine Reason. This is our Catholic culture. This is our great blessing of inheritance. But this too is our grave and urgent responsibility. The quest of many in science and psychology, of whom Leonard Carmichael's words are typical, is the restoration of the heritage of Western civilization. We have much to give such men of good faith as well as to receive from them.



### *Unions and Public Opinion*

In a period of depression, when the suffering and privation of the working population is an obvious public problem, most people regard the attempt of unions to improve the worker's standard of living as laudable. Public sympathy overwhelms public inconvenience. In addition, it is clear that at such times the union is the champion of the workingman and that without his organization he would be in much worse straits.

But in a period of prosperity, when wages are high and jobs are plentiful, the bond between the worker's goals and his union grows weaker. He himself becomes aware that he can achieve economic welfare without organization and collective bargaining. In the public mind, it becomes difficult to identify the union's continued drive for new members with anything except the officers' greed for a bigger treasury . . .

This short-sighted view is not openly espoused by any thinking person. But its popular influence is detected in the ease with which slogans concerning a worker's "right to work" and "control by union bosses" gain support. It is no accident that restrictive labor legislation comes at times of high prosperity and that it is difficult to amend that legislation so long as prosperity prevails. — *Gladys W. Gruenberg in SOCIAL ORDER, January, 1955.*



## Documentation

### Christmas Eve Address

POPE PIUS XII

*This message, which was delayed by the serious illness of His Holiness,  
was released to the press January 3, 1955*

**“BEHOLD** I will bring upon her, as it were, a river of peace” (Isaias 66, 12). This promise, announced in the messianic prophecy of Isaias, was fulfilled, with mystic significance, by the Incarnate Word of God in the New Jerusalem, the Church: and We desire, beloved sons and daughters of the Catholic world, that this same promise should resound again over the entire human family as the wish of Our heart this Christmas eve.

A river of peace upon the world: this is the desire which We have most constantly cherished in Our heart, for which We have most fervently prayed and worked, ever since the day when God in His goodness was pleased to entrust to Our humble person the exalted and awe-inspiring office of common father of all peoples, which is proper to the vicar of Him to Whom all races are given for His inheritance (Ps. 2, 8).

Casting a glance backwards over the years of Our pontificate with regard to that part of Our mandate which derives from the universal fatherhood conferred upon Us, We feel that it was the intention of Divine Providence to assign to Us the particular mission of helping, by means of patient and almost exhausting toil, to lead mankind back to the paths of peace.

At the approach of the feast of Christmas each year, We would have ardently wished to be able to go to the cradle of the Prince of Peace and offer Him, as the gift He would cherish most, a mankind at peace and all united together as in one family. On the contrary We had to experience—during the first six years—the indescribable bitterness of seeing nothing at all around Us but peoples in arms, carried away by the mad fury of mutual destruction.

We had hoped—and many others had hoped with Us—that once the rage of hatred and revenge had finally ceased, there would very soon have dawned a period of secure peace. Instead, there continued that agonizing state of uneasiness and danger which public opinion described with the name “cold war” because in reality it had little or nothing in common with true peace and had much of the character of a truce that trembled at the slightest touch. Our annual return to the cradle of the Redeemer continued to be a sad obligation of sorrows and anxieties, with an intense desire to draw therefrom

the courage that was necessary in order to persist in exhorting men to peace and pointing out to them the right road to attain it.

Can we, at least now in this sixteenth year of Our pontificate, fulfill that wish? According to many reports, the cold war has slowly been replaced by a period of decreased tension between the opposing parties, as if they were giving each other a longer breathing space; and not without some irony, this decreased tension has been given the name "cold peace." While We willingly recognize that this does represent some progress in the laborious ripening of peace properly so called, nevertheless it is not yet a gift worthy of the mystery of Bethlehem, where there appeared "the goodness and kindness of God our Saviour" towards men (Tit. 3, 4). For it is in too vivid contrast with the spirit of cordiality, of sincerity and of brightness that hovers around the cradle of the Redeemer.

In fact, in the political world, what is meant by "cold peace" if not the mere co-existence of various peoples based on fear of each other and on mutual disillusionment? Now it is clear that simple co-existence does not deserve the name of peace, to which Christian tradition, formed in the school of the lofty intellects of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, has come to apply the definition "the tranquillity of order." Cold peace is only a provisional calm whose duration is conditioned upon the changeable sensation of fear and upon the varying calculation of present strength: while it has about it nothing of true "order," which presupposes a series of relationships converging towards a common purpose that is right and just. Besides, by excluding all bonds of a spiritual nature between peoples so fragmentarily co-existing, cold peace falls far short of that which was preached and desired by the Divine Master: for His peace is founded on a union of souls in the same truth and in charity. It is defined by St. Paul as the "peace of God" which binds in the first place men's minds and hearts (Phil. 4, 7), and it is put into practice by acts of harmonious collaboration in every field of life, not excluding the political, social and economic fields.

Such is the reason why We do not dare to offer cold peace to the Divine Infant. It is not the simple and solemn "*pax*" (peace) which the angels sang to the shepherds on that holy night. Much less is it the "*pax Dei*" (peace of God) which surpasses all understanding and is a source of interior and complete joy (ibid). It is not even that peace which mankind today dreams of and longs for after so much affliction. However, We wish to examine in detail its shortcomings, in order that from its hollow void and its uncertain duration there may be born in the rulers of nations, and in those who can exercise any influence in this field, the imperative desire to transform it as soon as possible into true peace, which is, in reality, Christ Himself. For, since peace is order and order is unity, Christ alone is able and willing to unite men's minds in truth and love. It is in this sense that the Church points Him out to all peoples, in the words of the prophet, as being Himself of peace: "*Et erit iste pax . . .*" (and this man shall be our peace) (Micheas, 5, 5; cfr. Liturgical Office for Feast of Christ the King, *passim*).

## I. Co-existence in Fear

It is a common impression, derived from the simple observation of facts, that the principal foundation on which the present state of relative calm rests is fear. Each of the groups into which the human family is divided tolerates the existence of the other, because it does not wish itself to perish. By thus avoiding a fatal risk, the two groups do not live together; they co-exist. It is not a state of war, but neither is it peace: it is a cold calm. Each of the two groups smarts under the fear of the other's military and economic power. In both of them there is a grave apprehension of the catastrophic effect of the latest weapons.

Each follows with anxious attention the technical development of the other's armaments and the productive capacity of its economy, while it entrusts to its own propaganda the task of turning the other's fear to its advantage by strengthening its meaning. It seems that in the field of concrete politics reliance is no longer placed on either rational or moral principles, for these, after so many delusions, have been swept away by an extreme collapse into skepticism.

### CURRENT POLITICAL PRACTICE

The most obvious absurdity of the situation resultant from such a wretched state of affairs is this: current political practice, while dreading war as the greatest of catastrophes, at the same time puts all its trust in war, as if it were the only expedient for subsistence and the only means of regulating international relations. This is, in a certain sense, placing trust in that which is loathed above all other things.

On the other hand, the above-mentioned political practice has led many, even of those responsible for government, to revise the entire problem of peace and war, and has induced them to ask themselves sincerely if deliverance from war and the ensuing of peace ought not to be sought on higher and more humane levels than on that dominated exclusively by terror. Thus it is that there has been an increase in the numbers of those who rebel against the idea of having to be satisfied with mere co-existence, of renouncing relationships of a more vital nature with the other group, and against being forced to live all the days of their lives in an atmosphere of enervating fear. Hence they have come back to consider the problem of peace and war as a fact involving a higher and Christian responsibility before God and the moral law.

Undoubtedly in this changed manner of approach to the problem there is an element of "fear" as a restraint against war and a stimulus to peace; but here the fear is that salutary fear of God—Guarantor and Vindicator of the moral law—and, therefore, as the Psalmist teaches (Ps. 110, 10), it is the beginning of wisdom.

Once the problem is elevated to this higher plane, which alone is worthy of rational creatures, there again clearly appears the absurdity of that doctrine which held sway in the political schools of the last few decades: namely, that war is one of many admissible forms of political action, the necessary,



and as it were the natural, outcome of irreconcilable disputes between two countries; and that war, therefore, is a fact bearing no relation to any kind of moral responsibility. It is likewise apparent how absurd and inadmissible is the principle—also so long accepted—according to which a ruler who declares war would only be guilty of having made a political error should the war be lost. But he could in no case be accused of moral guilt and of crime for not having preserved peace, when he was able to do so.

It was precisely this absurd and immoral concept of war which rendered vain, in the fatal weeks of 1939, Our efforts to uphold in both parties the will to continue negotiations. War was then thought of as a die, to be cast with greater or less caution and skill, and not as a moral fact involving obligation in conscience and higher responsibilities. It required tombs and ruins without number to reveal the true nature of war: namely, that it was not a luckier or less lucky gamble between conflicting interests but a tragedy, spiritual more than material, for millions of men; that it was not a risking of some possessions, but a loss of all: a fact of enormous gravity.

How is it possible—many at that time asked with the simplicity and truth of common sense—that, while every individual feels within himself an urgent sense of moral responsibility for his own most ordinary acts, the dreadful fact of war, which is also the fruit of the free act of somebody's will, can evade the dominion of conscience, and that there be no judge to whom its innocent victims may have recourse? In the atmosphere of that time, when people were beginning to return to common sense, widespread approval was given Our cry, "war against war," with which in 1944 We declared Our opposition to the pure formalism of political action and to doctrines of war which take no account of God or of His commandments. That salutary return to common sense, instead of being weakened, became more profound and more widespread in the years of the cold war, perhaps because prolonged experience made more clearly evident the absurdity of a life lived under the incubus of fear. Thus the cold peace, with all its incoherences and uneasiness, shows signs of taking the first steps toward an authentic moral order and towards a recognition of the elevated doctrine of the Church regarding just and unjust war, and the licitness and illicitness of recourse to arms.

### OBJECT OF THE MORAL ORDER

This goal will assuredly be attained if, on one side and the other, men will once again sincerely, almost religiously, come to consider war as an object of the moral order, whose violation constitutes in fact a culpability which will not go unpunished. In the concrete this goal will be attained if statesmen, before weighing the advantages and risks of their decisions, will recognize that they are personally subject to eternal moral laws, and will treat the problem of war as a question of conscience before God.

In the conditions of our times, there is no other way to liberate the world from its agonizing incubus except by a return to the fear of God, which in no way debases the man who willingly submits to it; rather, it saves him

from the infamy of that awful crime—unnecessary war. And who can express astonishment if peace and war thus prove to be closely connected with religious truth? Everything that is, is of God: the root of all evil consists precisely in separating things from their beginning and their end.

Hence also it becomes clear that pacifist efforts or propaganda originating from those who deny all belief in God—if indeed not undertaken as an artful expedient to obtain the tactical effect of creating excitement and confusion—is always very dubious and incapable of lessening or of eliminating the anguished sense of fear.

The present co-existence in fear has thus only two possible prospects before it: either it will raise itself to a co-existence in fear of God, and thence to a truly peaceful living-together, inspired and protected by the Divine moral order: or else it will shrivel more and more into a frozen paralysis of international life, the grave dangers of which are even now foreseeable.

In fact, prolonged restraint of the natural expansion of the life of peoples can ultimately lead them to that same desperate outlet that it is desired to avoid: war. No people, furthermore, could support indefinitely a race of armaments without disastrous repercussions being felt in its normal economic development. The very agreements directed to imposing a limitation on armaments would be in vain. Without the moral foundation of fear of God, they would become, if ever reached, a source of renewed mutual distrust.

There remains, therefore, the auspicious and lightsome other way which, based upon the fear of God and aided by Him, leads to true peace, which is sincerity, warmth and life, and is thus worthy of Him Who has been given to us that men might have life in Him and have it more abundantly (John 10, 10).

## II. Co-existence in Error

Although the “cold war”—and the same is true of the “cold peace”—keeps the world in a harmful state of division, yet it does not, up to the present, prevent an intense rhythm of life from pulsing therein. It is true that this is a life developing almost exclusively in the economic field. It is, however, undeniable that economics, taking advantage of the pressing progress of modern techniques, has by feverish activity attained surprising results, of such a nature as to foreshadow a profound transformation in the lives of all peoples, even those heretofore considered rather backward. Admiration unquestionably cannot be withheld for what it has done and what it promises to do.

Nevertheless, economics, with its apparently unlimited ability to produce goods without number, and with the multiplicity of its relationships, exercises over many of our contemporaries a fascination superior to its potentiality, and extends to fields extraneous to economics. The error of placing such trust in modern economics is again shared in common by the two camps into which the world is today divided. In one of these, it is taught that, since man has given proof of such great power as to create the marvellous technico-economical composite of which he boasts today,

he will also be able to organize the liberation of human life from all the privations and evils from which it suffers, and in this way effect a kind of self-redemption. On the other hand, the conception gains ground in the opposing camp that the solution of the problem of peace must be sought in economics, and particularly in a specific form thereof, that of free exchange.

We have already had occasion at other times to expose the baselessness of such teachings. About a hundred years ago followers of the free commerce system expected wonderful things from it, attributing to it an almost magical power. One of its most ardent converts did not hesitate to compare the principle of free exchange, insofar as its effects in the moral world are concerned, with the principle of gravity which rules the physical world, and he attributed to it, as its proper effect, the drawing of men closer together, the elimination of antagonism based on race, faith, or language, and the unity of all human beings in unalterable peace (Richard Cobden, *Speeches on Questions of Public Policy*, London, Macmillan, 1870; Vol. 1, pp. 362-366).

### OVER-ROSY HOPES

The course of events has shown how deceitful is the illusion of entrusting peace to free exchange alone. Nor would the result be otherwise in the future if there were to persist that blind faith which confers on economics an imaginary mystic force. At present, moreover, there are lacking those foundations of fact which could in any way warrant the over-rosy hopes nourished today, as in the past, by followers of this teaching. As a matter of fact, while in one of the camps co-existing in cold peace this highly vaunted economic freedom does not in reality yet exist, it is, in the other, completely rejected as an absurd principle. There is, between the two, a diametrical opposition in their ways of conceiving the very fundamentals of life—an opposition which cannot be reconciled by purely economic forces. Nay more, if there are—as there actually are—relations of cause and effect between the moral world and the economic world, they must be so ordered that primacy be assigned to the former, that is, the moral world, which must authoritatively permeate with its spirit the social economy. Once this scale of values has been established and its actual exercise permitted, economics will, insofar as it is able, consolidate the moral world and confirm the spiritual postulates and forces of peace.

On the other hand, the economic factor might place serious obstacles in the way of peace—particularly of a cold peace, in the sense of an equilibrium between groups—if, employing erroneous systems, it were to weaken one of the groups. This could occur if, among other eventualities, individual people of one group were to engage, without consideration or regard for others, in a ceaseless increase of production, and a constant raising of their own living standard. In such a case, an upsurge of resentment and rivalry on the part of neighboring peoples would be inevitable, and consequently also the weakening of the entire group.

Prescinding from this particular consideration, however, one must be



convinced that economic relationships between nations will be factors of peace insofar as they will obey the norms of natural law, will be inspired by love, will have due regard for other peoples and will be sources of help. Let it be held for certain that in relations between men, even merely economic relations, nothing is produced spontaneously—as does occur in nature, which is subject to necessary laws—but everything depends substantially on the spirit. Only the spirit, the image of God and the executor of His designs, can establish order and harmony on earth, and it will succeed in doing so to the same extent that it becomes the faithful interpreter and docile instrument of the only Saviour Jesus Christ, Who is Himself Peace.

### III. False Premises for Unity

Moreover, in another matter even more delicate than that of economics, error is shared by the two camps co-existing in the cold peace: an error, namely, regarding the principles which animate their respective unity. One of the camps bases its strong internal cohesion on a false idea, an idea, moreover, violating primary human and Divine rights, yet at the same time efficacious; while the other, forgetful that it already possesses an idea that is true and has been successfully tested in the past, seems instead to be tending towards political principles which are evidently destructive of unity.

During this last decade since the war, a great yearning for spiritual renovation urged souls to unite Europe strongly, the impetus coming from the natural living conditions of her peoples, with the purpose of putting an end to the traditional rivalries between one and another, and of assuring a united protection for their independence and their peaceful development. This noble idea did not present motives for complaints or diffidence to the world outside of Europe, in the measure that this outside world was favorably disposed toward Europe. It was also believed that Europe would have easily found within herself the animating idea for her unity. But the succeeding events and recent accords which, as is believed, have opened the way to a cold peace, no longer have for a basis the ideal of a more extensive European unification. Many, in fact, believe that the governing policy is for a return to a kind of nationalistic state, closed within itself, centralizing therein its forces, unsettled in its choice of alliances and, consequently, no less perilous than that which had its time of highest development during the last century.

Too soon have been forgotten the enormous mass of lives sacrificed and of goods extorted by this type of state, and the crushing economic and spiritual burdens imposed by it. But the real error consists in confusing national life in its proper sense with nationalistic politics: the first, the right and prized possession of a people, may and should be promoted: the second, as a germ infinitely harmful, will never be sufficiently repelled. National life is, in itself, that operative composite of all the values of civilization which are proper and characteristic of a particular group, for whose spiritual unity they constitute, as it were, its bond. At the same time, it enriches, as its own contribution, the culture of all humanity.

In essence, therefore, national life is something not political; and this is confirmed by the fact that, as history and practice demonstrate, it can develop alongside of others, within the same state, just as it can also extend itself beyond the political frontiers of the same state. National life became a principle of dissolution within the community of peoples only when it began to be exploited as a means for political purposes; when, that is to say, the controlling and centralizing state made of nationality the basis of its force of expansion. Behold then the nationalistic state, the seed of rivalries and the fomenter of discord.

### DANGERS OF NATIONALISTIC STATE

It is clear that, if the European community were to move forward on this road, its cohesion would become, as a result, quite weakened in comparison with that of the opposing group. Its weakness would certainly be revealed on that day of future peace destined to regulate with foresight and justice the questions still in abeyance. Nor should it be said that, in new circumstances, the dynamism of the nationalistic state no longer represents a danger for other peoples, being deprived, in the majority of cases, of effective economic and military power, for even when the dynamism of an imaginary nationalistic power is expressed in sentiment rather than exercised with actions, it is equally offensive to the mind; it feeds on distrust and breeds suspicion within alliances, impedes reciprocal understanding and thereby loyal collaboration and mutual help, to the same extent as it would if it had at its command effective force.

What would become, then, in such circumstances, of the common bond which is supposed to bind individual states in unity? What kind of a grand and efficacious idea would that be which would render them strong in defense and effective in a common program for civilization?

Some would like to see it as agreement in the rejection of that way of life destructive of liberty, proper to the other group. Without a doubt, aversion to slavery is worthy of note, but it is of negative value and does not possess the force to stimulate the human spirit to action with the same efficacy as does a positive and absolute idea.

Such an idea, instead, could be a love of the liberty willed by God and in accord with the needs of the common good, or else the ideal of natural law, as the foundation of an organization of the state and of states.

Only these, and like spiritual ideas, acquired now for many long centuries as part of the tradition of a Christian Europe, can sustain comparison—and moreover emerge victorious in it, to the extent that these ideas are really lived—with the false idea, though concrete and effective, which apparently holds together in cohesion, not without the aid of violence, the other group: the idea, namely, of an earthly paradise to be attained as soon as a determined form of social organization shall be realized. Though illusory, this idea has succeeded in creating, at least outwardly, a compact and hardy unity, and in being accepted by the uninformed masses; it knows how to inspire its members to action and voluntarily to make sacrifices. The same idea, within the political framework which expresses it, gives to its director

■ strong capacity for seduction, and to the adept the audacity to penetrate as a vanguard even into the ranks of the other side.

Europe, on the other hand, still awaits the reawakening of her own consciousness. Meanwhile, in what she stands for—such as the wisdom and organization of associated living and as an influence of culture—she seems to be losing ground in not a few regions of the earth.

Verily, such a retreat concerns the promoters of nationalistic policy, who are forced to fall back before adversaries who have taken over the same methods and made them their own. Especially among some peoples until now considered colonial, the process of organic maturing toward an autonomous polity, which Europe should have guided with perception and care, was rapidly turned into nationalistic out-breaks, greedy for power. It must be confessed that even these unforeseen eruptions, damaging to the prestige and interests of Europe, are, at least in part, the fruit of her own bad example.

Does this mean only that Europe has momentarily lost her way? In any case, that which must remain, and without doubt will remain, is the genuine Europe, that is, that composite of all the spiritual and civil values which the West has accumulated, drawing from the riches of individual nations to dispense them to the whole world. Europe, conforming to the dispositions of Divine Providence, will again be able to be the nursery and dispenser of those values if she will know how to resume wisely her proper spiritual character and to repudiate the divinization of power.

Just as in the past the well-springs of her strength and of her culture were eminently Christian, so now too will she have to impose on herself a return to God and to Christian ideals if she is to find again the basis and bond of her unity and true greatness. And if these well-springs seem to be in part dried up, if this bond is threatened with rupture and the foundation of her unity crumbling, the historical and present responsibility falls back upon each of the two groups who find themselves now facing each other in anguish and mutual fear.

The motives ought to be enough for men of good-will, in one and the other camp, to desire, to pray and to act, in order that humanity may be liberated from the intoxication of power and of pre-eminence, and in order that the Spirit of God may be the Sovereign Ruler of the world, where once Almighty God chose no other means for saving those whom He loved than that of becoming a weak Babe in ■ poor manger. "A child is born to us, and ■ son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder" (Isaiah 9, 6; Introit, Third Mass of Christmas Day).

#### IV. Co-existence in Truth

Although it is a sad thing to note that the present rupture of the human race took place, in the beginning, between men who knew and adored the same Saviour, Jesus Christ, still there appears to Us to be a well founded hope that, in His name, too, ■ bridge of peace may yet be built between opposing shores, and the common bond, so sadly broken, be re-established.

There is, in fact, some hope that today's co-existence may bring mankind



closer to peace. In order, however, that this expectation be justified, such co-existence must in some way be co-existence in truth. Now a bridge cannot be built in truth between these two separate worlds unless it be founded on the human beings living in one and the other of these worlds, and not on their governmental or social systems. This is so because, while one of the two parties still strives in large measure, whether consciously or unconsciously, to preserve the natural law, the system prevailing in the other has completely abandoned this basis.

A one-sided supernaturalism might refuse entirely to take such an attitude into consideration, alleging the reason that we live in a redeemed world and are therefore withdrawn from the natural order; or some might say that the collectivist character of that system ought to be recognized as a "historical truth," in the sense that it too corresponds to the will of God—but these are errors to which a Catholic can by no means submit. The right road is quite different.

### DUTY OF UNIFICATION

In both camps, there are millions in whom the imprint of Christ is preserved in a more or less active degree: they, too, no less than faithful and fervent believers, should be called upon to collaborate towards a renewed basis of unity for the human race. It is true that, in one of the two camps, the voice of those who stand resolutely for truth, for love and for the spirit, is forcibly suffocated by the public authorities, while in the other people suffer from excessive timidity in proclaiming aloud their worthy desires. It is, however, the duty of a policy of unification to encourage the former and to make heard the sentiments of the latter.

Particularly in that camp where it is not a crime to oppose error, statesmen should have greater confidence in themselves: they should give proof to others of a more firm courage in foiling the maneuvers of the obscure forces which are still trying to establish power hegemonies, and they should also show more active wisdom in preserving and swelling the ranks of men of good-will, especially of believers in God, who everywhere adhere in great numbers to the cause of peace.

It would certainly be an erroneous unification policy—if not actually treachery—to sacrifice in favor of nationalistic interests the racial minorities who are without strength to defend their supreme possessions: their faith and their Christian culture. Whoever were to do this would not be worthy of confidence, nor would they be acting honorably if later, in cases where their own interests demanded it, they were to invoke religious values and respect for law.

There are many who volunteer to lay the bases of human unity. Since, however, these bases, this bridge, must be of a spiritual nature, those sceptics and cynics are certainly not qualified for the task who, in accordance with doctrines of a more or less disguised materialism, reduce even the loftiest truths and the highest spiritual values to the level of physical reactions or consider them mere ideologies.

Nor are those apt for the task who do not recognize absolute truths nor admit moral obligations in the sphere of social life. These latter have already in the past—often unknowingly, by their abuse of freedom and by their destructive and unreasonable criticism—prepared an atmosphere favorable to dictatorship and oppression; and now they push forward again to obstruct the work of social and political pacification initiated under Christian inspiration.

In some places it happens not rarely that they raise their voices against those who, conscientiously, as Christians, take a rightful active interest in political problems and in public life in general.

Now and then, likewise, they disparage the assuredness and strength Christians draw from the possession of absolute truth, and on the contrary, they spread abroad the conviction that it is to modern man's honor, and redounds to the credit of his education, that he should have no determined ideas or tendencies, nor be bound to any spiritual world. Meanwhile, they forget that it was precisely from these principles that the present confusion and disorder originated, nor will they remember that it was those very Christian forces they now oppose that succeeded in restoring, in many countries, the freedom which they themselves had dissipated.

## V. Promotion of Common Good

Certainly it is not upon such men that the common spiritual foundation can be laid and the bridge of truth built. Indeed, it may well be expected that, as occasion demands, they will not find it at all unseemly to be partial to the false system of the other shore, even adapting themselves to be overcome by it in case it were momentarily to triumph.

In awaiting, therefore, with confidence in the Divine mercy, that spiritual and Christian bridge, already in some way existing between the two shores, to take on a greater and more effective consistency, We would exhort primarily the Christians of the nations where the Divine gift of peace is still enjoyed to do everything possible to hasten the hour of its universal re-establishment.

Let these convince themselves, above all, that the possession of truth, if it were to remain closed within themselves, almost as if it were an object of their contemplation for deriving therefrom spiritual pleasure, would not be of service to the cause of peace; the truth must be lived, communicated and applied to all phases of life. Also truth, and particularly Christian truth, is a talent that God placed in the hands of His servants in order that, with all that they undertake, it may bear fruit in works for the common good.

To all possessors of this truth, We would wish to propose a question, before the Eternal Judge asks it, whether they have used this talent fruitfully, in any way to be worthy of the invitation of the Master to enter into the joy of His peace. How many, perhaps even priests and lay Catholics, ought to feel remorse for having instead buried in their own hearts this and other spiritual riches because of their own indolence and insensibility to human misery!

In particular, they would become culpable if they should tolerate that the people be left as though shepherdless, while the enemy of God, taking advantage of his powerful organization, is producing destruction in souls not solidly enough formed in the truth. Equally responsible would priests and laity be, if the people were not to receive and find from Christian charity in practice that active help which the Divine will prescribes. Nor would those priests and laity fulfill their obligations, were they voluntarily to close their eyes and keep silent concerning the social injustice of which they are witnesses, thus furnishing an occasion for unjust attacks against the capacity of the social action of Christianity and against the efficacy of the social doctrine of the Church, which, with the help of Divine grace, has given many and such unquestionable public demonstrations, not least in these recent decades.

In case the failure to which We have referred were to occur, it would likewise be those priests and laity who would bear the responsibility that groups of the young, and even pastors of souls, let themselves, in some cases, be won over to radicalism and erroneous progressivism.

### SOCIAL OBLIGATION

The conduct of Christians—be they of high or humble state, or be they more or less prosperous—who would not be resolute in the recognition and observance of their own social obligations in the management of their economic affairs would cause more grave consequences to the social order, and also to the political order. Whosoever is not ready to limit justly in relation to the common weal the use of his private goods, be it done freely according to the dictates of his own conscience, or even done by means of organized provisions of a public character, he is helping, insofar as it depends on him, to impede the indispensable primacy of personal impulse and responsibility in social life.

In democratic systems one can fall easily into such an error, when individual interest is placed under the protection of these collective organizations or of a party, where one seeks protection for the sum total of individual interests, rather than the promotion of the good of all; under such a guise the economy becomes easily subject to the power of anonymous forces which dominate it politically.

Beloved children, We are thankful to the Divine goodness for having given Us yet another opportunity to indicate to you, with paternal solicitude, the path of goodness. May the earth, abundantly watered by the Giver of true peace, be able to proclaim glory to God in the highest! "Let us go up to Bethlehem" (Luke 2, 15). Let us go back there close to the crib of sincerity, of truth and of love, where the only-begotten Son of God gives Himself Man to men, in order that humanity may know again in Him its bond and its peace. "Today true peace comes down to us from Heaven" (Office of Christmas, response, second lesson). In order that the earth be worthy to receive it, We invoke abounding Divine blessings upon all.



# On Tailors and Fashions

POPE PIUS XII

*Address to the Sixth International Congress of Tailors, September 9, 1954*

**W**HEN, during your 1952 Congress, you had to deliberate on the choice of your next meeting place, it was with enthusiasm that you decided to come to Rome, and it was at that time that you conceived the hope of being able to pay Us a visit. Now, today, your hope is being realized. At the end of your Sixth International Congress of Master Tailors We have the pleasure of receiving you and of assuring you of Our esteem and Our sympathy.

Mindful of the spiritual and moral problems which modern life presents to different social groups, especially to professional associations, We should like in these few words to try to answer your expectations and to look briefly at some aspects of your activity.

Since the last century modern society has seen the appearance of a whole flowering of new professions. The applications of mechanics and electricity, always most astonishing and varied, have involved the complete modification of ancient methods of work. They have transformed and renewed a great many sectors of the economy. But that evolution has respected, in part at least, a small number of activities, especially those that concern the most basic needs of man—food and clothing. You are among these privileged persons, for they fully deserve the title “privileged” whose trade still escapes the servitude of mass production and the standardization of work, which is so harmful to its spiritual value.

It has often been said that among living beings man is one of the weakest, one of those who is most deprived of natural protection. But God has given him intelligence which enables him to make up for this deficiency through the exercise of industry. It is therefore up to you to complete, so to speak, the work of the Creator by furnishing to your fellow creatures the clothing which they need. Christ, making His disciples admire one day the delicate attire of a simple flower of the fields, told them: “Yet I say to you that not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed like one of these” (*Matt. 6:29*).

If, then, the plants and animals are arrayed in marvelous colors, which attract the eye and compel admiration, may not man in this respect imitate the Divine Artist? Doubtless he seeks above all to protect himself from the inclemencies of the weather, but, as soon as it is possible for him to escape from the routine of daily life, he strives to distinguish himself in

the style of his dress through some personal and characteristic trait. Clothing, moreover, visibly and in a permanent way expresses the position of a person. This varies according to sex, age and social function. It shows both those things which link the individual with certain social classes and which, within those groups themselves, confer a special rank upon him. Formal clothes especially aim at making visible through the richness of their materials and their irreproachable tailoring the excellence of him who wears them. In addition to its obvious utilitarian aspect, your profession has a truly esthetic character, which guarantees its originality and demands, besides manual skill, the use of the gifts of the mind.

That is why the art of the tailor essentially escapes mechanization. Without doubt it is also necessary to assure even here an intensive production which fulfills the daily needs of the greatest numbers. But the place of honor will always remain with the uncommon work, the one in which the artisan exploits to the maximum the qualities of the materials used and employs all his resources to realize the ideal he has conceived.

It is characteristic of an art to seek constantly to renew itself, to invent unceasingly new forms and to emphasize nuances. It is undoubtedly necessary to satisfy the desires of the buyer, but the producer will try to attract his attention and solicit his interest by the beauty and finesse of his work. This effort is entirely justifiable. But, on the other hand, the materialistic spirit that inspires so great a part of today's civilization has not spared the field of fashion. Too often there is seen displayed there a provoking luxury, ignorant of all shame, desiring only to flatter vanity and pride. Instead of elevating and ennobling the human person, clothing sometimes tends to degrade and debase it.

### RESPECT NORMS OF DECENCY

Even if you are not responsible for these regrettable manifestations, you cannot remain indifferent to them. Far from maintaining the already too strong inclination toward immodesty, always be careful to respect the norms of decency and good taste, of an elegance sanely understood and perfectly honest. In brief, instead of following the materialistic current which is leading so many people astray today, deliberately put yourselves at the service of spiritual ends. It is not possible to partition human life, to fix certain spheres of it in which morality has no word to say. Clothes express in too evident a fashion the tendencies and tastes of a person to escape from certain quite clear rules which surpass and govern the simple esthetic point of view.

If it is necessary to condemn vain ostentation, it is altogether normal for man to try to enrich through the exterior brilliance of his clothes the extraordinary occurrences of life and through them to show his feelings of joy, pride or even grief. The white garment of a child on the morning of his First Communion, that of a young woman on the day of her marriage, do these not symbolize the totally immaterial splendor of a soul which is offering the best of itself? And, moreover, according to the par-



able of the Gospel, is not entry into the Kingdom of Heaven reserved for those alone who will wear the mysterious wedding garment which God requires from those He calls, that is to say, a clear and pure conscience whose faults have been effaced by Divine Grace, which transforms it and makes it worthy to appear before God? Is there not here a magnificent moral ideal for your profession?

You work immediately in the service of the human person, elevated by God to an incomparable dignity when, through His Incarnation, He became a member of humanity. In the most humble of your fellow creatures shines the image of the Son of God. As the maternal hands of the Blessed Virgin busied themselves to make Christ's clothes—perhaps even that robe for which lots were cast on Calvary by soldiers unaware of the significance of their act—so it is God Whom you continue to clothe in the men of today. This is not a matter of pure symbolism. In one of the most solemn passages of the Gospel, the announcement of the Last Judgment, Christ expressly alluded to this work of charity: "Come, take possession of the kingdom prepared for you," He said to His elect, "for I was naked and you covered me." And He added, "As long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me" (Cf. *Matt.* 25: 34,36,40,43).

This passage from the Gospel confirms for you a magnificent promise and a great consolation. In spite of the difficulties that hinder the exercise of your professional activity, do not lower your aims to the single matter of temporal gain. Know how to remain always aware of the profound meaning of your work and of its human end. Far from hindering its exercise, this ideal will aid you in safeguarding its dignity and will make you justly proud of the nobility of your task.

As a pledge of the divine blessing which We ask for you, your families and your co-workers, We bestow with all Our heart Our Apostolic Benediction.

## THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph F. MacFarlane

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Patrick H. Collins

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.



**In Him Was Life** *by John P. Delaney, S.J.*

The author draws from the gospel and the Mass inspiring reading on marriage, the family, the care of children; money and recreation, pain and suffering, and the daily job. \$2.75

**Mary and the Popes**

*edited by Thomas J. M. Burke, S. J.*

Healthy devotion to Mary must be based on sound doctrine. Here are five papal documents, translated into modern American idioms by Jesuit theologians, offering an authoritative and clear statement of Catholic belief about Mary. \$1.00

**Love Is My Vocation** *by Tom Clarkson*

Father C. C. Martindale, S. J. a strict and not-easily impressed critic writes: "We would have thought that there was really no more room for a book about St. Thérèse of Lisieux; but here is a different one from the rest . . . Mr. Clarkson makes it clear that she was one of those of whom St. Paul says, 'The world was not worthy.'" \$3.00

**Christian Conversation** *edited by Anne Fremantle*

*A Catholic thought for every day of Lent.* Here is a book that will be any day's inspiration. It is a conversation with the saints and men and women of all Christian ages—a brilliant anthology in fine literary taste. Many magnificent woodcuts enrich its beautiful selections. *For Lent only:* a \$4.75 purchase for \$3.50

**A Doctor At Calvary** *by Pierre Barbet, M.D.*

"We did not know; nobody has ever told us that!" These were the words, spoken by Pope Pius XII, so moved was he by Dr. Barbet's reverent investigation of the injuries Our Lord suffered at Calvary. The doctor's account of Our Lord's Passion deepens our realization of the meaning of the inspired words: "Jesus suffered and died for us." \$3.00

*at your Catholic Bookstore or*

**THE AMERICA PRESS • 70 East 45th Street • New York 17, N. Y.**



# "Measuring Up" to a Saint



**I**n France and England during the Middle Ages it was the custom of wealthy parishioners to donate candles tall as themselves for use on shrine altars.

This practice gave rise to the expression of "measuring up" to a saint. People of moderate circumstances brought flowers and later, small candles—simple offerings which gradually evolved into the present day Vigil Light.\*

Today, Vigil Lights burn before countless shrines and side altars throughout the world, serving as public acts of faith—external symbols of private devotion encouraging others among the faithful to pray in their hour of need or thanksgiving.



\*Vigil Light is the trade mark name identifying votive lights made exclusively by Will & Baumer.

## *Will & Baumer*

**CANDLE CO., INC.**

THE PIONEER CHURCH CANDLE MANUFACTURERS OF AMERICA

|          |          |             |         |
|----------|----------|-------------|---------|
| SYRACUSE | BOSTON   | NEW YORK    | CHICAGO |
|          | MONTREAL | LOS ANGELES |         |